

# THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

Edited by John T. Saywell

VOLUME XLI, NO. 2

JUNE, 1960

Conservatives, Liberals, and Labour in the 1870's	
BERNARD OSTRY	93
Mackenzie and His Cabinet, 1873-1878	
SISTER TERESA AVILA BURKE	128
Reviews ( <i>see following page</i> )	149
Recent Publications Relating to Canada	175
Books Received	181
Notes and Comments ( <i>see following page</i> )	183

---

---

PUBLISHED BY UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

## REVIEWS

HISTORY PAPERBACKS IN 1959: Ancient and Mediaeval: by Elliot Rose; Modern: by A. Lloyd Moote; American: by Kenneth McNaught; American Intellectual: by Ramsay Cook .....	149
WEBER, <i>The Nationalist Revival in France, 1905-1914</i> : by John C. Cairns .....	166
DEUTSCHER, <i>The Prophet Unarmed: Trotsky, 1921-1929</i> : by Robert H. McNeal .....	166
DE GAULLE, <i>War Memoirs, General de Gaulle: Unity, 1942-1944</i> : by Philip C. F. Bankwitz .....	168
ERICKSON, <i>Edward T. Cardwell: Peelite</i> : by J. B. Conacher .....	169
REID, McNAUGHT, and CROWE, comps., <i>A Source-book of Canadian History: Selected Documents and Personal Papers</i> : by Margaret A. Ormsby .....	170
WAINWRIGHT, <i>George Croghan: Wilderness Diplomat</i> : by George F. G. Stanley .....	172
FRÉMONT, <i>Les Français dans l'ouest canadien</i> : by Lewis H. Thomas .....	173
CURRY, <i>Stephen Leacock: Humorist and Humanist</i> : by J. I. Cooper .....	174

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

Governor General's Awards; Contributors .....	183
---	-----

---

## THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW Continuing

### *The Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada*

Founded at the University of Toronto in 1896

Articles in the REVIEW are indexed in the *Canadian Index* and in the *International Index to Periodical Literature*.

Communications with regard to subscriptions and advertising should be addressed to The Director, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada. Individual subscriptions \$4.00 a year.

AUTHORIZED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OTTAWA

## Conservatives, Liberals, and Labour in the 1870's

BERNARD OSTRY

DURING THE EARLY 1870's, Canadian trade unions reached the peak of strength they were to enjoy until the great depression put a temporary end to their progress. Their growth was a consequence not only of the prosperity and rapid industrialization of the late sixties but also of the protection afforded them by the Trade Unions Act of 1872. Labour's declining influence at Ottawa during the later seventies was the result of the change in administration in 1873-4 as well as the depressed economic conditions following the panic of 1873. Party policies and party leaders had a hand in the rise of the labour movement and in its later failures. What, then, were the attitudes of the Conservative and Liberal parties and their leaders to the industrial worker, and how did these attitudes affect the labour movement's future development?

As a result of the dislocation of industry in the United States following the Civil War, substantial numbers of American workers were added to Canadian trade union ranks. From Europe, too, steady emigration had been maintained, particularly from Great Britain where many unions encouraged their members to seek employment overseas. Those who emigrated brought with them not only their skills but also their experience in trade unions and political activity in more highly industrialized nations. Gradually, the isolation which local unions had experienced prior to Confederation began to break down, and in February, 1871 the first steps were taken to form a central trade union organization in Toronto. It was inevitable that the impetus should have come from Ontario, the province where industry had made the greatest strides, and from the leaders of the skilled trades unions whose past experience, organization, and determination had placed them in the vanguard of the movement. Unions had existed in Canada for half a century and by 1871 trade union leaders appear to have assumed that their associations had the same validity as other analogous bodies in

the community.<sup>1</sup> But towards the end of that year, when they undertook a campaign for shorter hours similar to the campaigns being waged in Britain and the United States, they little appreciated the political character which their struggle would assume.

The broad outline of the events leading to the Trade Unions Act of 1872 has long been familiar. In the early seventies Canada was prospering and rising prices made employers more amenable to wage demands. There was, moreover, a severe shortage of skilled workers in Canada's industrial and manufacturing centres. Most Canadian newspapers and politicians were calling for a vigorous immigration programme. Of the various motives underlying this general outcry the need for skilled craftsmen in the new, expanding, and partially protected manufacturing enterprises of Canada was not the least important. However, it appeared that British workers were somewhat less eager to emigrate owing to improved conditions and remedial legislation at home, while a tight market in the United States created an ever-increasing premium for skill which was drawing Canadian labour away. The typographical trades, for example, included some of the most highly skilled workmen in a community where the demand for their craft was growing and the ability of their employers to absorb increased wage costs was admitted.<sup>2</sup>

On February 29, 1872 Typographical Union No. 91 informed the various printing firms in Toronto that their members wished to have the nine-hour system instituted in the shops in which they were em-

<sup>1</sup>This is certainly the impression gained by Professor D. G. Creighton, who, in his "George Brown, Sir John Macdonald and the 'Workingman'," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXIV (Dec., 1943), 371, goes so far as to state: "The legislatures of Canada had evidently never dealt with the subject of unions and combinations . . .", and by H. A. Logan, who, in *Trade Unions in Canada: Their Development and Functioning* (Toronto, 1948), says that trade unions "were illegal bodies without their being aware of it. . . ." There had, however, been instances of greater awareness on the part of unions and the public at an earlier date. For the developments in Nova Scotia, Quebec, and elsewhere see Margaret Mackintosh, *An Outline of Trade Union History in Great Britain, the United States and Canada* (Ottawa, 1938), 5; Logan, *Trade Unions*, 24-7; H. A. Innis and A. R. M. Lower, eds., *Select Documents in Canadian Economic History, 1783-1885* (Toronto, 1933), 311-13.

<sup>2</sup>Innis and Lower, *Select Documents* 534-9; 621-2; 632. Lloyd Ulman, *The Rise of the National Trade Union* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), 7-9; G. E. Jackson, "Emigration of Canadians to the United States," *Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science* (May, 1923), 24-34; V. S. Clark, *History of Manufactures in the United States* (2 vols., Washington, 1916, 1928), I, 390-3; C. W. Wright, *Economic History of the United States* (New York, 1949), 450 et seq.; G. D. H. Cole, *A Short History of the British Working Class Movement, 1789-1947* (London, 1948), 205-13; J. R. Commons, et al., *History of Labour in the United States* (4 vols., New York, 1936) I, 34, 51; J. E. Middleton, *The Municipality of Toronto: A History* (2 vols., Toronto, 1923), II, 559-62; R. H. Coats, "The Labour Movement in Canada," in Adam Short and A. G. Doughty, eds., *Canada and Its Provinces* (22 vols., Toronto, 1913), IX, 294-6; Leslie E. Wismer, *Workers Way to a Fair Share* (Montreal, 1951), *passim*.

ployed. To implement the nine-hour rule adopted by their union, representatives of the most skilled and essential group employed by the *Globe*—the night compositors—met with the proprietor on March 2 and asked for an increase in their rate of pay and a reduction of hours. This meeting was the first step by the union leaders to establish the principle of the nine-hour day throughout the printing offices of Toronto—a principle which they hoped would later be applied to the less skilled workmen within the industry, and ultimately introduced in the other industries represented by their Trades Assembly. The owner of the *Globe* was fully aware of the significance of this first step. Nevertheless, he agreed to pay his night compositors the higher rates they requested and in the course of the negotiations accepted a system whereby the daily attendance of the compositors was to be shortened.<sup>3</sup> The terms agreed upon by the *Globe* and the union were presented to the other master printers in the city who accepted them. From this success it seemed that the printing establishments of Toronto had realized that they could not afford to antagonize so vital a section of the labour movement. From the union's point of view, if the newspapers of Toronto could be moved to adopt the nine-hour system, the likelihood of their fellow unionists being refused similar demands by employers throughout the Dominion would be considerably lessened.

Shortly after these successful negotiations, the less skilled members of the union—the job printers—sought a similar agreement. On this occasion, however, the publisher of the *Globe* hesitated and refused to deal with the representatives of his employees, excusing his behaviour on the basis that the issue was one which concerned the foreman of the *Globe* job office and not the publisher. The foreman, however, as the publisher knew, was seriously ill and it was impossible to determine whether he would ever be well enough to return to work. Unable to elicit a decision from their employer, the union resolved on February 13 to issue an ultimatum to the master printers to accept the nine-hour principle for all their employees or face the possibility of a strike.<sup>4</sup>

A Conservative newspaper, the *Leader*, and four other printing houses were prepared to meet with the job printers and accept their requests. The union's position was further strengthened at this very moment by a decision of their colleagues in the Trades Assembly. The campaign for a reduction of hours was reaching its climax and on March 15, 1872 a large and enthusiastic mass meeting of "mechanics" at Toronto's Music Hall unanimously carried the following resolution: "We, the working men of the City of Toronto . . . empower the Trades Assembly to memorialize the employers of labour of this city for the

<sup>3</sup>*Globe*, March 22, April 2, 1872.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*

adoption of the nine-hour system, the same to come into operation on the first Monday in June next, and also to request the answer to their petition by the 1st of May."<sup>5</sup>

On three separate occasions the union appealed to the master printers to meet with them in an effort to arrive at an amicable settlement, but on each occasion they were turned down.<sup>6</sup> By the time the union issued its final ultimatum on March 18, the employers' peremptory refusal was a foregone conclusion. Five days later the vote to strike was taken and by the early hours of March 25 the last trade unionist had left his bench. The fight was on: the *Globe* and its allies versus Toronto Typographical Union No. 91 and its friends.

The man who had forced the workmen into the streets was George Brown, Reformer and publisher of the Liberal party's most influential journal. One could not necessarily have anticipated Brown's unrelenting attitude toward labour organization and bargaining by reading his editorials, although he had accumulated a long list of anti-union victories in his relations with Canadian labour over the preceding thirty years. In 1845 his father had dismissed several of his staff on the *Banner* who had become members of the Typographical Society. He declared a non-union policy from which he never budged in spite of the condemnation of the union and various sections of the public. Later, in the spring of 1854, when the Typographical Society was seeking a raise in wages in Toronto, George Brown denounced the journey-men printers as conspirators and held a meeting of the master printers at the *Globe* (as the *Banner* had then become) to seek their support in breaking the union. He agreed to pay the rate demanded if the men left the union, and, when a strike followed the men's refusal, was successful in having the printers arrested for conspiracy, charged, and fined!<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup>The resolution was moved by John Hewitt of the Coopers' Union and seconded by Alderman Hallam. *Globe*, March 16, 1872; *Leader*, March 16, 1872. This was not the first mass meeting in Toronto on behalf of the nine-hour system. There had been an earlier one on February 15, 1872: *Globe*, Feb. 15, 16, 1872. In the weeks that followed, several individual unions such as the ironworkers and railwaymen had carried on independent campaigns for a fifty-four hour week.

<sup>6</sup>*Ontario Workman*, June 13, 1872. On April 5, nearly two weeks after the men had left their jobs, the union again attempted to meet with the owner of the *Globe*. See, Public Archives of Canada, *Brown Papers*, David Sleeth, W. R. Shields, and Jas. Macdonald to Brown, April 5, 1872.

<sup>7</sup>Wisner, *Workers' Way*, 39-40; *Leader* April 1, 1872. Other examples of Brown's anti-unionism before 1870 may be found in the unpublished Ph.D. thesis of J. M. S. Careless, "George Brown and the Toronto Globe, 1850-1867: A Study in Opinion" (2 vols., Harvard University, 1949), I, 431-45. See also Middleton, *Municipality of Toronto*, II, 558. Later on the *Globe* supported the anti-union statements of the grand jury during the Moulders Union Strike in Toronto in 1870-1; *Globe*, Jan. 20, 26, 28, 1871; D. C. Masters, *The Rise of Toronto, 1850-1890* (Toronto, 1947), 106-9.

But Brown had also shown considerable sympathy for the trade unionists of Great Britain and as late as the autumn of 1871 he came out in support of the nine-hour campaign in England,<sup>8</sup> his editorials resounding with phrases which he was flatly to contradict within a few months when he came to deal with a similar movement at home. However, intellectual integrity or consistency had never been the strongest feature of George Brown's arguments against unions and their needs. Rejecting his own admissions concerning the importance of the non-economic aspects of the shorter working day, he set out to damn the campaign in the crudest kind of market-place analysis.<sup>9</sup> Aware of the ineffectiveness of his own exposition of the "simple law of supply and demand," he took sensible precautionary steps to see that it operated to his own advantage. For example, in March, 1872 while the union was under the impression that it was negotiating with the *Globe*,<sup>10</sup> Brown quietly organized the Master Printers Association,<sup>11</sup> thereby discouraging the few firms who wished to accept the union's demands. Should a strike occur the association members would declare their shops non-union and co-operate with one another to complete printing orders and see that the newspapers were brought out regularly.<sup>12</sup> The formation of the association was announced on March 22 in a letter dated three days earlier published in the *Globe* and elsewhere. Brown placed his offices at the disposal of the association for their daily meetings. He proceeded to advertise for and to import blackleg printers from the countryside to keep the *Globe* running, with some success. In a further attempt to undermine the union, he and his associates hired a detective to report on the activities of individual union members.<sup>13</sup>

In a desperate manœuvre to break the strike and the trade union movement altogether, Brown's association sought the opinion of a leading solicitor to discover whether trade unions had any legal foundation under the Canadian "constitution."<sup>14</sup> The "opinion," given by Harrison,

<sup>8</sup>*Globe*, Sept. 20, Nov. 15, 1871. The *Globe* stated: "If the work of the world can be done as well by eight hours daily labour as by ten, or possibly even better, why shouldn't it?" Cf. *Ontario Workman*, April 18, 1872.

<sup>9</sup>*Globe*, Feb. 16, 1872.

<sup>10</sup>See correspondence between union and employers of March 22 printed in *ibid.*, March 23, 1872.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, March 22, 1872. The regulations governing the association were printed a week later. Their chief purpose was the maintenance of piece-work and a working day of not less than ten hours. *Ibid.*, March 29, 1872.

<sup>12</sup>Brown received at least one offer of help from outside Toronto. Lawson McCulluch & Co., of Hamilton wired: "If we can do anything here in the way of work jobbing or other wise that will assist in your strike pray command us": Brown Papers, Lawson McCulluch & Co., to Brown, March 26, 1872.

<sup>13</sup>Brown already had at least one informer reporting from the floor of his shop when the strike occurred. See Brown Papers, Alex. Jacques to Brown (private), March 25, 1872.

<sup>14</sup>The opinion of Robert A. Harrison was printed in the *Globe* in two full columns on

no doubt declared what Brown wished and the *Globe* announced a few days later that evidence had been "obtained of Criminal Acts of the most undeniable character by prominent members of the Society."<sup>15</sup> Criminal prosecution for conspiracy was obviously the next step but it was a big one to take. Toronto's trade unions were not to be the "pushover" they had been in 1854. Brown needed the public backing of more representative sections of the community than the Master Printers Association to destroy the fundamental liberty of the Canadian labourer in 1872. The anti-union movement would have to be broadened.

On April 4 the *Globe* presented some of the fruits of Brown's efforts to widen his campaign. At a secret meeting from which the press of Toronto was excluded, Brown announced that a meeting of employers had been held to consider how best to combat the "nine-eight" hours' movement, that it was largely attended, and that it was the "firm determination" of those present "to resist" the union's efforts. There was also a unanimous vote of thanks to the *Globe* and the other members of Brown's association "for their determined resistance to the organized attempt now being made to place the manufacturing interests of the city under the despotic rule of a secret union." The employers pledged their support to a man. Within forty-eight hours Brown was able to print in the *Globe* "the largest number of advertisements . . . ever received in one day."<sup>16</sup>

On April 8 the employers published a manifesto on the editorial page of the *Globe* directed to "Employers of labour and to the Public generally," which fired a broadside against the nine-hour movement. "Any attempt on the part of the Employees to dictate to them in what way, or to what extent they shall lawfully use their own resources is not only an unwarrantable interference with the rights of others, but a very transparent attempt to introduce amongst us the Communistic system of levelling." According to this group of employers, should the nine-hour movement succeed, it would undoubtedly cripple Canadian industrial expansion and raise the cost of living precipitately, thus causing great and unnecessary suffering to all. Therefore, as a public service they were determined to maintain the ten-hour day and "resist any

---

March 30 but the solicitor's report is dated March 27. This would suggest that the association sought his advice and a detective's assistance almost immediately after the strike began: *Globe*, March 30, 1872. Harrison was a Conservative member of Parliament at the time. In 1875, during the Liberal administration, he was appointed Chief Justice! If Thomas Moss, a partner of Harrison and a Liberal, had been approached for an official opinion he would have given one in favour of the strikers: *Leader*, April 4, 1872.

<sup>15</sup>*Globe*, April 3, 1872.

<sup>16</sup>*Leader*, April 4; *Globe*, April 4, 5, 6, 1872.

attempts on the part of our Employees to dictate to us by what rules we shall govern our business." The document was signed by an impressive number of painters, glaziers, boot and shoe manufacturers, harnessmakers, and tinsmiths.<sup>17</sup> One week after this manifesto appeared twenty-four warrants were issued for the arrest of the members of the Vigilance Committee of Typographical Union No. 91. On the morning of April 16 thirteen trade unionists were arraigned before the police magistrate on a charge of "conspiracy."<sup>18</sup>

By involving the *Globe* in a national controversy and taking the lead in an anti-union campaign, George Brown fostered an alignment of political forces which few contemporaries imagined possible. From the outset Brown had stated that he and his associates were bent on breaking the union "at whatever cost." "They have submitted long enough to the insolent dictation of a few reckless lads," he wrote three days before the strike began. Brown's editorial strategy was simple: first, to label the nine-hour movement as alien and unCanadian; then, to attack the leaders of the Typographical Union as impractical and irresponsible dupes; and finally, to persecute and destroy all Canadian trade unions by uniting the employing class in a great crusade against the labour movement, seeking to cloak his vindictiveness with an air of respectability by invoking an ancient English statute whereby workers might be treated as common criminals for believing they were at liberty to protect their economic and social interests. His actions and his words were never repudiated or denied by the party that was to call him to the Senate a few months hence, but they were to excite the wrath of many less closely associated with the labour interest in Toronto and throughout the Dominion.<sup>19</sup>

It was this savage bullying by the Liberal party's most influential spokesman which turned the Toronto unions into a cohesive force and inspired their determination to defeat the Grit leader at all costs. It was Brown's vindictiveness that forced the unions to seek support for their cause from a wider section of the community. A few days after

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, April 8, 9, 1872. Cf., letters in the *Leader*, April 13, which point out that such employers as the tinsmiths who signed the document in fact represented firms with fewer numbers of workmen than those who refused.

<sup>18</sup>*Globe*, April 17, 19; *Leader*, April 17, 1872. By the next morning the number of "conspirators" had grown to 14; the other ten warrants issued by the magistrate were never acted upon.

<sup>19</sup>*Globe*, March 22, 23, 26, 29, 30; April 2, 10, 19, 1872. According to Brown there was "no such class as those styled capitalists in Canada . . . the tyranny of the employed over his master was infinitely truer." Besides, "there was positively no disagreement between Proprietors and the compositors" and any injustice could be settled by the "people" who have "entire political power in their hands." The trouble really stemmed from "foreign agitation carried on by paid agents." *Leader*, April 11; *Ontario Workman*, Nov. 21, 1872.

the strike a letter concerning it appeared in the *Leader*. It closed with the following paragraph:

An election for members of the House of Commons is soon to take place. The Reform Party of Ontario were never so strong, in my opinion, as they were one short month ago, and they might have swept the country but for Mr. Brown's insolent and tyrannical treatment of the printers and working classes generally. His conduct has ruined the prospects of the Party by driving away from it the great BODY OF WORKING MEN who have hitherto belonged to it. No artisan, no working man, can vote for those whom The Globe may support; and sadly and truly enough reform is now for the present a *lost cause*; killed by one who professes to be its champion.<sup>20</sup>

A series of mass protest meetings was held in Toronto and elsewhere in sympathy with the unions fighting Brown. A working-class newspaper, the *Ontario Workman*, was founded in Toronto to facilitate the struggle. Within a week a copy of a letter appeared in its columns appealing to the British trade union movement for help, asking that organization to discourage all emigration to Canada until the Canadian unions had secured their fundamental rights. The letter was signed by the leaders of the Canadian trade union movement.

Beginning with a simple refusal to discuss the nine-hour principle with his job printers, George Brown was soon carried along on a tidal wave of his own creation which promised to engulf and destroy the trade union movement in Canada unless halted in its course. It was the *Globe's* refusal to compromise that eventually contributed to the achievement of a union victory out of all proportion to the movement's numbers; a victory of far greater significance for the future of labour than the right to work nine hours instead of ten.

It was fortunate for the workers that several Conservative politicians in Toronto did not share the attitude toward trade unionism of George Brown and his Liberal paper. Indeed, the greatest friend the strikers had during the first weeks of the crisis was James Beaty, proprietor and editor of a leading Conservative newspaper in Toronto, the *Leader*. Beaty was a member of the Dominion Parliament for a Toronto constituency and had risen from his position as a leather merchant to hold directorships in several industrial and financial companies. His influence was especially important in that he had long been in opposition to Brown and knew the wiles of his opponent better than most. But his help was particularly useful because his newspaper provided the only channel to the public open to the Typographical Union and their supporters. Like Brown, Beaty was not interested in confining his views to private conversation. Having agreed to an increase in

<sup>20</sup>"An Old Reformer" to the editor of the *Leader*, March 30, 1872.

wages as well as the nine-hour day demanded by his employees, he supported the workers' case editorially opening his news columns to subjects of interest to trade unionists and encouraging the strikers to use his paper for the publication and dissemination of resolutions and correspondence that would aid their cause. Through the *Leader* the unions were able to rebut the slanders and misinformation emanating from the *Globe* and keep up the spirits of their members and the movement outside Toronto.<sup>21</sup>

Beaty's views were clear before the strike began: "The shortening of the hours of labour is one of the most commendable movements inaugurated by working men." When George Brown organized the Master Printers Association, Beaty refused to be a party to it and declined to attend the secret meetings in Brown's offices. While Brown was preparing his attack on the union of March 27, Beaty placed his own opinion before his readers:

Thus far, he [Beaty] had made it a governing rule of life to do unto others as he would others should do unto him, and having the best interest of the mechanics and labouring community at heart, in view of the increased cost of living in their city, he considers that workingmen have rights which he is willing to respect. As in the past, so now, he means to be amongst the foremost to aid the working, industrious, and sober men to obtain a livelihood and independence in Canada, where no one need fail if governed by these cardinal virtues.<sup>22</sup>

In the same issue he carried the union's announcement that the Master Printers (with one or two exceptions) had refused their demands, and the union's appeal to printers to keep away from Toronto. Beaty supported the strikers' plea for common action and pointed out that

It seems somewhat inconsistent for employers who oppose trades' unions on principle, to form themselves into a union, the better to defeat the just demands of their workmen. By doing so, one could imagine that the principle upon which trade societies are founded, is acknowledged, and yet we find a blatant politician of this city acting as president of a union of employers whose avowed object is to crush the hardworking mechanics who have respectfully intimated their intention of adhering in future to the nine-hour system.

He could see the direction in which Brown was moving. By example, moreover, Beaty was suggesting that the Master Printers might not have either a moral or an economic case and that only a desire to crush unions altogether could induce people to take the stand adopted by Brown and his associates.

<sup>21</sup>This is not to say that the *Leader* derived no benefit from its decision. It was able to choose staff from among the most highly skilled of those on strike and to increase its circulation to workingmen. But it served the unions by employing some of the strikers and it never benefited financially from the conflict in comparison with the *Globe*.

<sup>22</sup>*Leader*, March 18, 1872.

The next day the *Leader* carried the resolution of the Toronto Trades Assembly calling for "moral and financial" help to frustrate the weak and foolish efforts "of those whose avowed object was to crush the grand principle of Unionism." Beaty chose the occasion to lecture his patrons on the *Leader's* attitude to problems of labour-capital relations and to explain how his common sense and generosity had been applied in the *Leader* offices where they had proved of mutual benefit to capital and labour. His theme was a "fair day's pay for a fair day's labour," never forgetting the necessity for adjusting wages to fluctuations in trade, increasing living costs, and the reasonable demands of workmen.

But James Beaty's views extended beyond a recognition of the advantages to be derived from progressive capitalism: he could perceive the wider context of the issues produced by the strike. More important than all his statements on the justice of the nine-hour movement was one which Brown never cared to counter. Canadian industry was in its infancy but as it grew and the productive process improved, Canada would require increasing numbers of more highly skilled artisans. This being the case, Beaty wanted to know how it was

possible that we can retain them in our midst, when by crossing the line they would not only have to work less time but receive more wages. The course pursued by Capital in Toronto at the present time is the most suicidal that could be imagined, and will not only prevent emigration to Canada, but many of those who do come here will not remain with us, but emigrate to the States, where they can do far better than they can here.

We are at present only just budding into life as a manufacturing city, and it is as well that masters and workmen should thoroughly understand each other—understand that the wages to be paid in Toronto must be commensurate with those of and in the United States and England for the same sort of work, and that the hours constituting a day's work shall be in Toronto similar to those elsewhere.<sup>23</sup>

These were arguments that political leaders in Ottawa, pondering the possibility of a "national policy" could hardly fail to consider seriously. Many skills would be required to complete the great transportation and industrial projects contemplated. Severe disadvantages in the workers' social condition in Canada as compared with those in Britain or the United States were not likely to be conducive to the fulfilment of such schemes. Within a month of Beaty's editorials, the organized workers of Canada, as noted, sent out an appeal to their fellow workmen in Britain discouraging emigration to Canada while working conditions remained unsettled and difficult.<sup>24</sup> It looked as if

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, March 27, 29, 1872.

<sup>24</sup>*Ontario Workman*, April 25, 1872.

steps might have to be taken in Ottawa to prevent Brown and his supporters from threatening the Conservative programme.

The stand taken by James Beaty and the *Leader* was not without results. As George Brown was to admit, "If the proprietor of the *Leader* had united with the master printers, they could have crushed out this movement—so far as the printers were concerned—in three days."<sup>25</sup> This statement was made during a fit of rage against the disunity in the Master Printers' ranks and there can be little doubt had Beaty gone along with Brown, the *Globe* would have found the job of crushing the union much easier. But the *Leader's* role had other effects: it encouraged the nine-hour movement outside Toronto and acted as a centre of news and comment from which other journals in Ontario and Quebec took their lead. Most of the newspapers supporting the movement and the strikers were also supporters of the Macdonald administration, and this naturally tended to increase the political colour which the strike was assuming.<sup>26</sup> Every item which would help the strikers was given great prominence in the *Leader*; every disappointment suppressed or inconspicuously reported. Sympathetic strikes like that of the bookbinders, victories for the nine-hour movement in England or elsewhere in Canada, the personal idiosyncracies of Brown, successful attempts to waylay blacklegs,<sup>27</sup> financial support for the strikers—all these and many other similar items were prominently displayed, along with editorials and correspondence heavily weighted in favour of the union's demands. Brown's more successful tactics, however, were either sneered at, attacked, or ignored. But once the cry of illegality was raised, the character of the struggle changed. Undoubtedly many Tories agreed with Brown rather than with Beaty about the strike and the nine-hour movement, but it was one thing to be out of sympathy with the specific purpose of a particular strike and quite another to deny labour the right either to organize or to strike.

In the eyes of those whose responsibility it was to apply the common law statutes in Canada, however, the striking unions were guilty of conspiracy. The repeal of the Combination Acts in England served only the trade unions of Great Britain. The success that crowned the efforts of Disraeli and the Trades Union Congress in 1871, like those of Francis Place and Joseph Hume in 1824–5, in no way affected Canadian

<sup>25</sup>*Leader*, April 19, 1872.

<sup>26</sup>The Grit journals appear not to have followed Brown's line consistently. The *Montreal News*, the *Belleville Intelligencer*, the *St. Catharines Times*, and the *Toronto Telegraph* did, but these journals did not pursue the issue as continuously as those friendly to the Tories such as the *Montreal Star*, the *London Herald*, the *Cobourg Sentinel*, the *Prescott Telegraph*, the *Brantford Daily News*, the *Montreal Northern Journal*, the *Dundas Banner* and others. The *Hamilton Standard* which supported the unions most energetically at first deserted them toward the end of their struggle.

<sup>27</sup>*Leader*, April 9, 15, 1872.

labour. Gladstone's act respecting trade unions, celebrated as it had become, concerned Britons alone. The only hope the strikers had was that the statutory protection afforded British unions would be adopted by the legislators in Ottawa before Brown went too far. The question in men's minds centred around the fear that the long and bitter struggle of British unions to rid themselves of these mediæval restrictions would have to be repeated in Canada. On April 3 the Toronto workingmen held their third mass meeting at which most of the important local Conservatives and trade union leaders were present. A series of resolutions was passed, condemning Brown's use of an out-dated law and supporting the typographical unions.<sup>28</sup> Then, on April 16 nearly ten thousand men, women, and children gathered in Toronto's Queen's Park to celebrate Thanksgiving and to demonstrate their sympathy with the nine-hour movement and the arrested trade unionists. The meeting was addressed by workers and their enthusiastic Conservative supporters. Two days later the Prime Minister of Canada announced in the House of Commons his intention to introduce a bill "to relieve Trades' Unions from certain disabilities under which they labour at present, and to place them upon the same footing upon which they stand in England."<sup>29</sup>

We know little of the evolution of Macdonald's decision. His correspondence is curiously silent on both the strike and the measures he was about to introduce in the House. The issue in Toronto seemed to be drawn along political lines. Furthermore, an election was in the offing. On the one hand stood Brown and his political colleagues supported by the *Globe* and its business associates, determined to destroy not only existing unions but also the principle that workers could join together for their mutual betterment. On the other hand were the trade unions and their friends backed by James Beaty, the *Leader*, and its Conservative followers, equally determined to win the strike and preserve inviolate the fundamental right of labour to combine in its own interest.<sup>30</sup> The term of the Dominion's First Parliament was running out. The government in Ottawa had been seriously weakened by the nature of the treaty signed at Washington and by the controversies surrounding the Red River Rebellion. The first endeavours to

<sup>28</sup>Included in the proceedings were letters from M. C. Cameron and Adam Crooks, Attorney-General of Ontario, in which they apologized for being unable to attend the meeting.

<sup>29</sup>*Leader*, April 19, Cf., the *Mail*, April 19, 1872. The *Globe* ignored this notice altogether. The bound report of the *Debates* in the Public Archives also omits the statement in the *Leader*.

<sup>30</sup>E.g. A. W. Lauder and E. K. Dodds at the meeting of April 16. *Leader*, April 19, 1872.

place the project for a transcontinental railway on a sound financial basis were not meeting with universal success and the new province of British Columbia was becoming restive. An economic programme had to be hammered out which would protect Canada's manufacturing and industrial interests from the crippling commercial policies of the United States. The Ontario Liberals under Edward Blake had succeeded, during the provincial elections a few months earlier, in defeating Sandfield Macdonald's Conservative "coalition." In the pre-election fever the Tories could ill afford to have the Liberal victory in Ontario appear as a prelude to a similar triumph throughout the Dominion. All this would seem to suggest that the positive step which Macdonald took to obtain for the trade union movement the security of a legal status was nothing more than political opportunism. But this view is not altogether satisfactory; for it hides almost as much as it reveals.<sup>31</sup>

There were many practical reasons which might have induced another public figure to keep silent. The Conservative politicians from Toronto were not all of Beaty's mind on the issue; nor, at this particular moment, did Beaty and his newspaper stand very high in Sir John's estimation. Indeed, in order to strengthen the Conservative press in Toronto, Macdonald assumed the lead in an endeavour to set up another Conservative paper, the *Mail*. In the course of privately seeking support for this enterprise, he had often criticized the *Leader*. "The *Leader* is so completely run down," he wrote Carling, "as to be of no value, but Beaty keeps it going as a toy to play with and will neither sell nor take any steps to make it an efficient paper."<sup>32</sup> For the first fortnight after its founding the *Mail* showed little sympathy for either the strikers or the nine-hour movement. Was its founder then to desert this new journal and his colleagues like Harrison and Patterson and by taking up the issue as presented by Beaty and the *Leader* rejoin a rival camp?

The Liberals seemed determined to follow Brown in his suicidal policy, and since none of the Grit leaders or the important members of the Liberal party publicly supported the strikers, this was an issue on which the Liberals were embarrassing neither Macdonald nor his Government. If anything, they were graciously accepting the opprobrium of being hand in glove with the most hated of employers. By

<sup>31</sup>D. G. Creighton, *John A. Macdonald: The Old Chieftain* (Toronto, 1955), 103-33.

<sup>32</sup>P. A. C., Macdonald Papers, 519, Macdonald to Carling (private), Nov. 24, 1871, cited in part in Creighton, *Macdonald*, II, 116. Shortly after this Macdonald wrote Harrison about the plans for the *Mail*, urging him to subscribe and bring in his friends. "An opportunity now offers for establishing a first-class journal in the interests of Conservatism which may not occur again for a long time; so I hope that you will put your shoulder to the wheel." Macdonald Papers, 520, Macdonald to Harrison (private), Feb. 9, 1872.

remaining quiet, the support of the unions would likely have fallen into Macdonald's lap while he could have avoided openly antagonizing the small businessmen and manufacturers who were supporting George Brown. Furthermore, new legislation would be required immediately in order to deal effectively with the arrest of the striking printers. In effect, this would mean introducing a bill at the beginning of a pre-election session of Parliament on a subject upon which unanimity within his own party was by no means certain and at a time when every moment would have to be used to counter the Opposition's frontal attack on the Government's major policies. In the short run, in terms of labour votes, would the effort required and risks to be faced be worthwhile? How many workers were involved? How many were permitted to vote? How many were likely to use their vote? In which electoral districts might the trade unionists' influence tip the balance in favour of a Tory candidate? In these terms the returns seemed hardly equal to the effort required.

The percentage of industrial workers in urban centres like Toronto, Hamilton, and Montreal who had the vote and the political interest to use it was exceedingly small, and the number of electoral districts where they could have made their limited voting strength felt was probably fewer than half a dozen. The Dominion franchise laws in operation during the general election of 1872 were still the provincial statutes of the pre-Confederation colonial administration.<sup>33</sup> It was unlikely that this householders' franchise included more than a handful of the most highly skilled and highly paid workers on the electoral rolls. The figures<sup>34</sup> of the results of the 1872 election in three urban centres suggest how limited the voting strength of this class must have been. If James Beaty could not muster more than 872 votes in Toronto East which was certainly not Toronto's wealthiest constituency at a time when there must have been nearly a thousand organized and aroused trade unionists in Toronto, one is frankly hard put to accept the thesis that all Macdonald was interested in was the industrial worker's vote. Macdonald may have had many shortcomings, but ignorance of where votes lay was certainly not one of them. In 1872 the artisan obviously was not in a position to wield much political influence at the polling station. Yet, in the face of possible difficulties with some of his own party and in spite of the risk of antagonizing a large number of small manufacturers and businessmen, Sir John A. Macdonald determined to remove the anomalies of the law and provide trade unionism with a

<sup>33</sup>The exception was Ontario, which was permitted to use its law of 1869.

<sup>34</sup>See A. C. Campbell, ed., *Rose's Handbook of Dominion Politics . . .*, (Toronto, 1886).

secure legal base. If there was so little to gain electorally, why did he bother?

The answer to this question is inevitably complex; and it is not spelled out clearly in the correspondence of the period. No doubt both parties saw the contest as one likely to be extremely close, and both determined to fight for every single available vote. But there were more pressing reasons, too. Looking at the fundamental problems with which Macdonald was wrestling at this time and the major policies he had determined upon, we can begin to piece together those factors which explain his concern for the industrial worker. The same reasons go far to explain why this trade union issue and the allegiance of the worker to the Conservative party should have featured so conspicuously in the political controversies during the weeks immediately preceding the general election of 1872.

"The great reason why I have always been able to beat Brown," Macdonald explained to his friend, M. C. Cameron, before the election, "is that I have been able to look a little ahead, while he could on no occasion forego the temptation of a temporary triumph." "Depend upon it," he wrote prophetically, "the long game is the true one."<sup>35</sup> It was this concentration on the "long game" which served Macdonald so well in constructing the National Policy in 1871, the policy of partially protected industrial expansion in the eastern provinces and encouraged settlement in the western territories, with the two regions united by a transcontinental railway and secured from United States domination by the Anglo-Canadian "alliance." It was his ability "to look a little ahead" that inspired the act respecting trade unions in the spring of 1872. The National Policy and the Trade Unions Act were more closely linked than at first appears to be the case.

In many respects, the key to both was immigration. The triumph of Macdonald's National Policy depended in large measure upon the willingness of Britain's poorer classes to make their permanent home in Canada. They would constitute his most effective defence against American penetration. They would provide the market necessary for the new manufactures as well as the labour required for the C.P.R. project. Their skills would be essential if both large and small scale industry were one day to flourish in Canada. Without them the newly acquired western possessions would remain a desert. If Canada could neither attract substantial numbers of immigrants nor hold them after they arrived, then the National Policy was doomed. This is borne out

<sup>35</sup>Sir Joseph Pope, ed., *Selections from the Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald* (Oxford, 1921), 156-61: Macdonald to Cameron (confidential), Jan. 3, 1872. Cf., Creighton, *Macdonald*, II, 126.

time and again in the remarks of Government spokesmen and in Macdonald's private correspondence. Especially is this true of the late seventies and eighties; but there is a considerable body of evidence which suggests that Macdonald was well aware of the problem earlier.<sup>36</sup>

In the Speech from the Throne on April 11, 1872 the subject of aids to immigration figured prominently. Lord Lisgar the Governor General called the attention of the House to the results of the Dominion-Provincial Conference on immigration held the previous September. "I do not doubt," he is reported to have said, "that you will be inclined to make ample provision for the encouragement of Immigration with the maintenance and extension of which the development of the vast natural resources of Canada is so vitally interwoven." On May 1 a bill was introduced to incorporate immigration aid societies. "It was the object of the Government," the Senate was informed, "to give all the aid in their power to all Societies who were endeavouring to bring additional population into the country." Shortly after, an act to amend the Immigration Act of 1869 in such a way as to assist immigrants with passage money received its second reading. The Opposition, though they grumbled occasionally about interference with "property and civil rights," supported these measures.<sup>37</sup>

Writing to Sir John Rose the day after the printers had been arrested, Macdonald spoke of the Government's plans for the pre-election session. "You will see by the Speech on the 11th at the opening of Parliament, that we have gone in for the Pacific Railway, Canal Extension, and a large measure of encouragement to immigration." Speaking of the railway, he explained the intention of the Government "to be liberal both in money and lands, as it is of importance to settle that country at once. The labour required will make a respectable immigration of itself."<sup>38</sup> At a time when he was spending public funds on a vigorous programme of assistance to immigration, when his twin policies of populating the West and binding it to the East by an expensively subsidized transcontinental railway depended upon the fulfilment of this immigration programme, and when he had allowed it to be known that the Government was anxious to protect Canadian manufactures from undue American competition, Macdonald could hardly be expected to ignore the attempts to maltreat the skilled labour essential to the success of the National Policy. Brown's action may have been legal but such tyranny could not be allowed to deprive Canada of the labour force it needed. For this reason alone, Macdonald would have to

<sup>36</sup>*Ibid.*, 291, 310-11 *et seq.* Creighton reports that in the summer of 1881, Macdonald's "main concern was immigration" (p. 315).

<sup>37</sup>Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 1872, 3, 9, 11, 13, 16, 256, 428-30, 648, 671-4, 1148.

<sup>38</sup>Macdonald Papers, 520, Macdonald to Rose (private), April 17, 1872.

act, and soon. If necessary, Macdonald would have to take the lead as the workingman's friend and immediately unite his party behind new legislation. Brown's "temporary triumph" would have to be crushed in the interests of "the long game."<sup>39</sup>

The *Leader*, Beaty and his friends in Toronto, and the Trades Assembly and its sympathizers would now be backed in Ottawa. The *Mail* would have to be brought into line, too. On May 7 Macdonald introduced two measures affecting trade unions.<sup>40</sup> No doubt he was delighted with the opportunity of fathering legislation "which would at once gratify the working man and discomfit the Liberals." However, there is little to support the view that his Trade Union Act was inspired by a social philosophy such as Disraeli propounded or by the deeply religious, even sentimental, humanism that coloured so much of Gladstonian social policy.<sup>41</sup> His two bills grew out of the realities of Canadian economic and political life. The anomaly of the law had been brought to the attention of the public by the determination and organization of a handful of skilled trade unionists aided by the inveterate Brown. A new law was passed because Canada had a Prime Minister sufficiently realistic to see the present in terms of the past as well as the future.

In the course of introducing the bills, Macdonald did not attempt to hide the reasons for his action nor did he try to clothe his motives in language especially designed for electoral purposes. Indeed, he admitted that with respect to the disparity between the Canadian and British laws concerned with trade unions "it was only since the opening of Parliament, that his attention had been called to it." The new Canadian legislation, he explained, was to be based on the relevant Imperial statutes. "His attention, and the attention of every one interested in the prosperity of Canada, had been called lately to the fact, that the law relating to Trades' Unions . . . was not the same as in England, and

<sup>39</sup>On April 17 a private member moved the appointment of a select committee to inquire into Canadian manufactures, stating that "manufacturers must be protected." He went on to say that "the Government were sending agents to all parts of Europe to bring hither immigration, and deserved credit for doing so, but it was worse than useless to bring skilled labour hither without adopting measures to secure it employment." He did not believe in one policy being pursued in the House and another out of it and repeated that he wanted such a policy as would bring skilled labour and find employment for it. He also wanted a home market for "our own people." The government did not oppose the motion. *Debates*, 1872, 45-58.

<sup>40</sup>An Act Respecting Trade Unions and An Act To Amend the Criminal Law Relating to Threats and Molestation. *Ibid.*, 392-3.

<sup>41</sup>Although the author expressed the opposite opinion in the course of a paper delivered before the Canadian Historical Association meeting in 1957, closer examination of Macdonald's speeches and correspondence, and particularly his attitude to the question of the franchise, substantiates the present viewpoint. Cf., Creighton, "George Brown," 373 and Macdonald, II, 124-5. Within Macdonald's party, there were critics of the strikers who may have induced him to introduce the Criminal Law Amendment Act. *Debates*, 1875, 1035-6.

that the English mechanic, who came to this country as well as the Canadian mechanic, were subject to penalties imposed by statutes that had been repealed in England, as opposed to the spirit of the liberty of the individual."<sup>42</sup>

Macdonald explained that he was not prepared to deal with all the issues dividing labour and capital. The subject as a whole was receiving the most careful investigation in Britain, and Canada would be in a position to benefit from recommendations yet to be made at Westminster if she restricted her own legislation to the problem in hand. A month earlier the *Mail*, accepting the inevitability and reasonableness of combinations of employers and employees, had condemned the conflict between labour and capital and called upon both groups to enter into "joint-stock" enterprises or profit-sharing schemes which would place the opposing groups on a footing of equality with one another. By this means the *Mail* believed friction could be ended.<sup>43</sup> While Macdonald was not prepared to go so far, he did speak of "the introduction of a comprehensive system" which he felt would emerge from the discussions under way in Britain. On June 11 his bill respecting trade unions received its second and third readings and in reply to some of his critics he repeated what he had already clearly stated on May 7 that "there was nothing in the bill which could do injustice to either employers or employees. Its object was to repeal a harsh Act, under which mechanics could be indicted for every association they might form. The amendment had been adopted in the British Parliament without a dissenting voice, because it was felt that the old law was too oppressive to be endorsed by free men. Recent events in Toronto had shown the necessity of adopting some amendment here."<sup>44</sup>

When pressed by one of his own supporters to withdraw the bill, the Prime Minister insisted that this "could not be done without injury to the Dominion, *for if workingmen should learn that the old law remained unchanged, they would not come to settle in Canada*" (author's italics). The motion for a second reading of the Trade Union Bill was carried on a division and it was passed on June 11. On the fourteenth, the day Parliament was prorogued, it received royal assent. Thus was the link between Tory and worker forged.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*, 1872, 392.

<sup>43</sup>The *Mail*, April 10, 1872. The suggestions were made in a long editorial entitled "Trades-Unionism." The editorial is of considerable interest, not only because, as the chief spokesman at this time of Macdonald's conservatism it accepted the principle of the workers' right to organize, but also because it puts forward one of the earliest Canadian suggestions emanating from a non-labour political source of a scheme for assuring long-term industrial peace by employer-employee combinations.

<sup>44</sup>*Debates*, 1872, 392.

<sup>45</sup>*Ibid.*, 1121-2, 1149. "An Act to amend the Criminal Law relating to Violence, Threats and Molestations" was also passed at the same time.

The Opposition was silent. There was little the Liberals could say: the bills which Macdonald had had passed were almost identical to those which Gladstone had introduced at Westminster the year before. Only the nominal leader of the Reform party, Alexander Mackenzie, had seen fit to say a few words during the debate.<sup>46</sup> He was against that portion of the bill which required the registration of unions. By the third reading he knew why he was against these clauses. He complained that "the clauses relating to the representation [*sic*—registration?] of Trades Unions was beyond the jurisdiction" of the Dominion House. It was a cry that was to be reiterated time and again in the future. As far as the Liberal leader was concerned, these matters were for "the Local Legislature, and not for this Parliament to deal with."<sup>47</sup> Mackenzie was already directing his followers to the provincial rights trail that Mowat, with the support of the Privy Council, was to blaze for the Liberal party.

Outside of the House, the bills received little attention when they were debated and passed.<sup>48</sup> The unions at first were cautious and even critical in their attitude to certain aspects of the proposed legislation. Brown never encouraged their opposition. Instead he busied himself with employers who were organizing against the nine-hour movement along lines he had already drawn for them. He was probably satisfied that the conspiracy charge against the arrested printers would keep them in line long enough to allow him and his friends successfully to establish "scab" shops.<sup>49</sup> However, George Brown was not having an

<sup>46</sup>In his youth Mackenzie had been "a keen observer of the Chartist movement" though he was out of sympathy with "the extreme measures the followers of Ernest Jones were ready to adopt." William Buckingham and George W. Ross, *The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie: His Life and Times* (5th ed., Toronto, 1892), 54. He often described himself as a true "worker," a mason, rather than "the friend of the working man" but at no time did he reveal the slightest understanding of the needs of the industrial worker. Like Brown, the longer he was in politics, the less sympathy he showed for the industrial workers' demands. This is borne out by his performance in the House, his "pic-nic" speeches to workers during the summer of 1877, and his private correspondence.

<sup>47</sup>*Debates*, 1872, 1122, Cf., Logan, *Trade Unions*, 41.

<sup>48</sup>The *Globe* had no comment. The *Mail* was pleased with Macdonald's decision to introduce the Trade Unions Act (April 19), supported the measure in principle (April 25, May 8) but hoped that the Prime Minister would not follow the British example by also passing the Criminal Law Amendment Act. The *Leader* whose correspondence and news columns were full of items concerning the trade union movement, especially the strike and shorter hours' campaign, said little about the legislation itself.

<sup>49</sup>Since their arrest, the fourteen members of the Vigilance Committee had been charged with conspiracy and the case against them as well as their defence presented before Police Magistrate MacNabb on April 17, May 6, and May 18. McNabb still held ten warrants which he had not yet acted upon but once Macdonald introduced his bills the Police Magistrate began to look upon the case in a somewhat different light. On May 18 he agreed to bind the men over to the assizes on \$400 bail. The men, therefore, were still "prisoners" and their colleagues still subject to arrest. *Globe*, April 19, May 19; *Ontario Workman*, Nov. 21, 1872.

easy time of it. As copies of the anti-union manifestos he allegedly inspired appeared on the notice boards of factories in Hamilton, Guelph, Toronto, Montreal, and elsewhere trade unionists, whose skills were badly needed (in the United States if not in Canada), "downed tools" and sought work at shops prepared to pay a wage scale based upon the fifty-four hour week.<sup>50</sup> There were open and less obtrusive defections from the Master Printers Association while large-scale industries like the railroads came out in support of the nine-hour work day.<sup>51</sup> But when the trade unions decided to express their appreciation of Sir John's handiwork publicly by holding a mass meeting and presenting a gift to Lady Macdonald "the wife of Canada's greatest statesman," Brown returned to writing scathing editorials of the kind that had already lost him the little respect workers of Toronto still retained for the "Thunderer."

When Macdonald first proposed his legislation, the trade unions were somewhat skeptical. They hoped it would not be merely a facsimile of the British bills and they begged workers not to sign the public petition being circulated in support of a bill about which they had as yet few details. By the beginning of May, however, they had come around to the view that Macdonald's bills would probably have to be accepted. Nevertheless, they did not hesitate to express publicly their dissatisfaction with at least three aspects of the measures. On May 16 the *Ontario Workman* reproduced a draft copy of the proposed legislation and called upon its readers to accept it and to do all in their power to have the second measure, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, repealed.<sup>52</sup> There was little else they could do within the two-party system but accept this gain and fight or beg for more later. But many of the leaders, especially in Toronto, were prepared to go farther in their expressions of satisfaction with Macdonald's stand as the decision to offer Lady Macdonald a token of their appreciation at a mass meeting of workmen showed.

<sup>50</sup>Brown found it necessary to deny publicly the authorship of these manifestos. *Globe*, May 20, 1872. Apparently the printers themselves were not doing as well as they suggested to the public. A most telling letter from the vice-president of the Toronto Typographical Union was published by the *Ontario Workman* in June which pointed out that the *Globe* was misleading its readers by publishing a report from the *Hamilton Standard* purporting to prove that the strike had been lost. *Ontario Workman*, June 20, 1872.

<sup>51</sup>McLeish & Co., deserted the Master Printers Association when they learned of the arrests of the strikers (*Leader*, April 17, 1872), and others began to accept trade unionists on fifty-four-hour week terms (*Ontario Workman*, May 2, 1872). The Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways agreed to the demands for a nine-hour day as did many of the larger industries in Eastern Canada. *Leader*, April 23, 1872.

<sup>52</sup>*Ontario Workman*, May 2, 16, 23, 1872. The *Workman* was perhaps in advance of some of the unions in its support of the bill. It was only on May 17 that the Trades Assembly decided to set up a committee to study the proposed bill. *Leader*, May 18, 1872.

The presentation took place at Toronto's Music Hall on July 11. The hall was jammed with workers and their friends. It was both a serious and gala occasion beginning with a speech on the strike by J. S. Williams who presided and ending with a torchlight procession through the heart of Toronto with the President of the Trades Assembly and the most honoured guests being drawn along in their carriages by members of the local trade union movement. Macdonald and Beaty received addresses; Lady Macdonald an inscribed gold jewel casket. The trade unionists, in their remarks at the meeting, made half-hearted attempts to appear politically neutral, but found it difficult to conceal their hatred for Brown. During the evening Macdonald delivered one of his few speeches on labour-capital relations and expanded his ideas in a way never permitted him in the House and rarely repeated outside.

He began by thanking the workers for their kind words and generous gift. He had acted as anyone in his place would have done and if thanks were due him he might claim it for the promptness with which he had moved. Macdonald explained that Harrison's opinion had drawn his attention to the anomaly of the law and Brown's "persecuting and uncalled for" behaviour made it clear that "prompt and decided action" was required to remove the evil and outmoded statute. He admitted that he had merely adapted the provisions of the English law of 1871 to Canadian circumstances and pointed out that the English statute had been passed by both Houses at Westminster in spite of the aristocratic background of the majority of their members. The bills injured no one; they infringed no rights. Registration was essential to unions being recognized as legal entities. There had been some criticism in the House from representatives of Lower Canada, but only because of their mistaken impression that Canadian trade unions were synonymous with French communes. He was able to allay French-Canadian fears by demonstrating how false it was to believe "that in uniting to protect the rights of labour you had any political object in view, any desire to subvert the institutions of the State, any desire to introduce into this country new principles of government, and new modes of political action." Macdonald was aware that in many respects the new legislation was unsatisfactory. He was anxious to see further steps taken. But, he insisted, caution must be the watchword. The Imperial Parliament was seeking changes in its labour legislation and once these statutes had been tried he saw no obstacle to introducing similar legislation in Canada.

However, if there were interminable delays in Britain, he would certainly not wait; he would push ahead alone and he hoped the trade union movement would always feel free to place their views before him. He could assure them of a sympathetic hearing at all times.

"It is a happy thing, Sir", he continued,

that at last, after years and years of blindness, and fears of suspicion, the relations between labour and capital are slowly but certainly assuming their just position. Labour and capital should meet precisely upon equal terms, and any law which prevents the employer and the employed from acting in a similar way, or from combining in the same degree and in the same manner, or from standing exactly upon the same footing, occupying the same status and the same platform, is unjust, improper and should be amended. (Cheers.)

Once equality had been established, "Then will come the question of arbitration for the adjustment of disputes, then will come concession, and then will come that real friendly feeling and unity of action between employer and employed without which the industry of no country can be permanently prosperous." He ended his address with a jocular reference to his own small but successful efforts as a "cabinet maker" and "joiner" and, amidst tumultuous applause, returned to his seat.<sup>53</sup>

George Brown could not see beyond the immediate political implications of the friendship between the leader of the Conservative party and the mechanics of Canada; nor did he comprehend the sources of this new alliance. His only reply to the impressive demonstration of July 11 and to Macdonald's ideas on labour-capital relations was to describe the testimonial as little more than a rich man's fraud foisted upon the ignorant worker and to regard Macdonald's ideas as merely the fatuous froth of a callous opportunist. In a series of editorials in the *Globe*, he suggested that the presentation far from being the result of a spontaneous expression of gratitude by trade unionists, was engineered by the Tory party for political purposes and paid for by one of their wealthier stalwarts, Senator Macpherson.

The day before the Music Hall demonstration, Brown chose to reveal the source of his information concerning the presentation. On July 10 he printed a letter from Terence Clarke,<sup>54</sup> a supposedly Conservative trade union leader, in an editorial which attacked the authenticity of trade union support for Macdonald's testimonial. Clarke was also a bricklayer and through the columns of the *Globe* and with the encouragement of its proprietor he began flinging a few choice bricks Sir John's way. He accused the delegates to the Trades Assembly of joining with

<sup>53</sup>*Mail*, July 12, 1872.

<sup>54</sup>Mr. Clarke described himself as "a member of the Trades Assembly and an enthusiastic Conservative" and Brown referred to him as a "Conservative by tradition and conviction" and one who "wishes the Ministerialists to triumph." By the thirteenth, however, we learn from Mr. Clarke that he had withdrawn as a delegate to the Trades Assembly some time previous and by the beginning of August he had managed to transform himself into a full-fledged Reformer! *Globe*, July 10, 13; Aug. 7, 1872.

the Tory party and of misrepresenting their machinations as being the work of trade unionists as a whole. All this was devised, of course. On the eve of the presentation Brown published a piece entitled "The Bogus Testimonial" and later described what had transpired as a "poor juggle."<sup>55</sup>

The result of George Brown's behaviour can be read in the columns of the *Ontario Workman*. The trade unionists' press became little more than the poor man's *Mail*.<sup>56</sup> Williams, Scott, Hewitt, McCormick, and other of the most influential trade union leaders in Canada were time and again to be found on the platforms of Tory candidates openly supporting Macdonald's party.<sup>57</sup> No doubt their support in certain constituencies helped to swing the seat. In Hamilton where there was a new seat being contested, this was undoubtedly the case.<sup>58</sup> Even Brown sensed something of the danger and in August he attempted to wrest the initiative from the Conservatives. In an editorial on "The Working-Man and the Liberal Party" Brown attempted to prove by a lengthy analysis of British politics that "in the discussions and struggles of the last fifty years [in Britain] . . . every proposal to ameliorate the social condition, or enfranchise any portion of the great industrial class of the country, had come from the liberal progressive party. . . ." Never in human memory had Conservatives suggested or attempted to facilitate the introduction of a single measure which might help the workingman. They had bitterly resisted and ridiculed every step the Liberals had made to elevate the poorer classes. In Canada, while they had been "driven from many of their antiquated notions and had come to be ashamed of many of the absurd and tyrannical ideas that their predecessors had held to with invincible tenacity," the Tory was still horrified by the "lower orders," was determined to keep the poor in their "place," and maintain the "exclusive rights of the ruling class." As for the law forbidding combinations: the Tories had passed it and the Liberals had had it modified.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, July 10; *Mail*, July 11, 13, 17; *Ontario Workman*, July 18, 1872.

<sup>56</sup>*Ontario Workman*, July and August, 1872, *passim*. In a letter to the *Globe*, Clarke stated that "Hewitt, at a recent meeting, proposed that the Assembly should become a committee for electioneering purposes in favour of the Government." *Globe*, Aug. 15, 1872. At the end of July, the workmen in Hamilton actually did hold a meeting and pass a resolution to do all in their power to support Chisholm and Witton, the two Ministerialist candidates. *Ontario Workman*, Aug. 1, 1872.

<sup>57</sup>This was especially true in the Toronto and Hamilton contests, where McCormack and the others often spoke with Beaty, Shanly, Witton, and others. *Mail*, Aug. 7, 17, 1872.

<sup>58</sup>Macdonald took a special interest in the Hamilton elections where a Grit had been returned previously. He hoped to win both seats and he was certain the Trade Unions Bill would help. Macdonald Papers, 520, Macdonald to D. McInnis (private and confidential), June 17, 1872; 521, Macdonald to Hon. I. Buchanan (confidential), June 29, 1872. Even after the election he took care to look after their interests. *Ibid.*, 263.

It was at this point that Brown became most eloquent and most bitter:

And when would ever Sir John or any of his followers have moved in the matter but to make, as they hoped, a little cheap political capital? Never! No more than they have ever done in any other thing, except to outbid for popularity, and to go contrary to their convictions in order to trip up the heels of political opponents. The extension of the suffrage, the abolition of property qualification for representatives, free schools and the equality of all before the law—who have advocated all these and carried all of them that have been carried? The party of progress. The Conservatives have resisted at every point; and then with marvellous assurance, when resistance was no longer possible, have turned round and claimed all the credit of carrying what they had so bitterly opposed. The Liberals have all along protested against any class in the community being treated as idiots or children and therefore they have not “patronized” the working classes or petted them, as if they could be flattered to believe or do anything. They have held that the honest son of toil needs no favours, requires no patronage;—that all he wants is a fair field and no favour; and the whole struggles of reform have been in order to break up the iniquities of class legislation, which have ever pressed most heavily on the lowest, and to secure that there be none insulted by exemption from burdens and consequent deprivations of rights, but that all shall bear their full share of national obligations, and hold in the same way their rightful part in national deliberations and in the performance of national work. It is an old stale dodge the Conservatives are trying at present—to palm themselves off as the workingmen’s friend. . . . They have always taken the most curious ways imaginable to prove that this is the case; and the great mass of the workingmen of Canada are too shrewd, and know the history of the past too well, to be imposed on by any such flimsy pretence or any such transparent delusion. They know that they have never been petted by these superfine gentlemen, except to be used as tools, and kicked aside immediately after. They know—let such men as Hewitt say what they like—that if a large proportion of the workingmen in Canada are this day without a vote because they happen not to be householders, though they pay taxes and earn a respectable income, it is due to those who are now boasting of friendly feelings, which they have never embodied in action.<sup>59</sup>

The Canadian workingman did know this; but the appeal was too late and the arguments irrelevant. The worker also knew that the author of this fine rhetoric was responsible for the most vicious steps taken to date to prevent his right to organize and to enjoy the protection necessary to deal with employers like George Brown.

Brown may have been correct in his assessment of the extent of party inspiration behind the trade unionists demonstration and presentations to the Tory leaders. But the time for smug editorials on Grit purity and Tory villainy had passed. To be effective, they ought necessarily to have emanated from a source less compromised during the strike. By persisting along these lines Brown revealed a serious error of judgment. So long as George Brown failed to recognize the needs of a labour movement in its infancy, refused to see the implications of

<sup>59</sup>*Globe*, Aug. 9, 1872.

his retrogressive line for the future relations of the Liberal party with the growing industrial classes, and insisted on behaving in a tyrannical and vindictive manner, he could be sure that the working classes would only be further alienated from the cause of Reform and more closely bound to the cause of union and progress. Macdonald, by his act respecting Trade Unions, appeared to offer the protection the weak required; George Brown, by his act to jail printers, did not. When the election day arrived, the majority of industrial workers who had a vote (and they were few) used it. They voted for Macdonald and for workingmen's candidates running on the Ministerialist ticket. In local and Dominion elections in Hamilton, Toronto, and elsewhere where their small vote might have counted, they tended to influence the results in favour of the Conservative party.<sup>60</sup>

Before turning to the period of Liberal administration and Conservative opposition, there is one episode which deserves attention. On September 5, 1872, the *Ontario Workman* announced a change of management. Until then this workingman's newspaper had been run by appointees of the Toronto Co-operative Printing Association. At a meeting of the co-operative's shareholders it was agreed to place the *Workman's* office in the hands of the paper's superintendent, J. S. Williams, and his two partners, "practical printers" Messrs. Sleeth and Mac-Millan.<sup>61</sup> What was not made public at that time (nor since) was that these three workers had acquired another "silent partner." The gentleman in question was none other than Canada's Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, leader of the party of union and progress.

Two days before the *Workman's* announcement, Macdonald wrote the following "private" letter to one of his political associates in Toronto:

Williams the Workingman and his two partners are, I believe, about to buy some of the plant of the "Telegraph" Office. I have agreed to advance them \$500.00 on the security of the goodwill of the paper, the lease, their present plant and what they may buy. May I ask you to take a chattel mortgage for the amount in my favour and draw upon me at sight for the money. I expect to be able to get

<sup>60</sup>H. B. Witton, the first workingman candidate to be elected to the Dominion Parliament, won a seat in Hamilton. For a brief biography, see *Ontario Workman*, Sept. 5, 1872. In the election in the Toronto Water Works Commission all candidates supported by the *Globe* were defeated, *Ontario Workman* and *Mail*, July 4, 1872. According to the *Ontario Workman*, Sept. 5, 1872, "the majority of the artisans threw, for the first time in their life, their influence into the Conservative scale, and felt that they were doing their duty, not only to themselves, but to their class." They denied the Reform party support because of Brown.

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1872; Logan, *Trade Unions*, 42-3. While it is possible to be fairly certain that the Williams concerned was J. S., I have not been able to discover whether MacMillan was also the leading trade unionist.

for the paper enough Government patronage to work off the \$500.00 without the necessity of their paying me any cash, but I must have the security. . . .<sup>62</sup>

The patronage Macdonald spoke of, however, was never very evident and after several months the *Workman* was still unable to repay the loan. Indeed, Macdonald's reference to security may have had a double meaning. Writing to his solicitor friend again the following July he said that "The chattel mortgage of the 'Ontario Workman' office will, I suppose, soon be maturing? Would you kindly look after its renewal for me. I do not suppose I will ever get the money, but I may as well keep it over them as security for good behaviour."<sup>63</sup>

It would be foolish to deny either the serious nature of these documents or the extent to which they reflect unfavourably upon the participants in this transaction. The trade unionists responsible for the approach to Macdonald must always suffer the accusation of having committed an unethical deed by secretly and irresponsibly compromising their supposedly independent labour journal, and thereby jeopardizing the future of their colleagues and of the movement of which they were respected national leaders. As for Macdonald, he was never very adept at distinguishing between his responsibilities as party leader and his duties as Prime Minister or Minister of Justice. But one must be exceptionally cautious in assessing letters of this kind, especially because they do suggest that a Canadian Prime Minister bought off a trade union leader; that a working-class leader sold out to a Tory politician. If he did, what were the circumstances? We would be lacking in understanding and generosity if we failed to consider the particular situation in which the transaction took place.

The *Ontario Workman* was founded at the height of the anti-Brown campaign. Its employees were chiefly leading strikers of the Typographical Union. J. S. Williams, an outspoken Conservative supporter, was at that time appointed superintendent of the newspaper. The journal had always been anti-Brown and anti-Reform but soon after the Trade Union Act had received its second reading, it came more and more to support Macdonald publicly. The newspaper, therefore, before the Dominion elections and before the loan was sought, had already somewhat compromised its independence by adopting a Tory worker as its chief and a pro-Conservative political line. Soon after it was founded the newspaper was in financial difficulties. As the only recognized working class weekly in trade union hands, it was an invaluable weapon and one can appreciate the owners' desire to keep it running even at the cost of borrowing from its "opponents." Indeed, the

<sup>62</sup>Macdonald Papers, 521, Macdonald to Henry O'Brien (private), Sept. 3, 1872.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid.*, 523, Macdonald to Henry O'Brien, July 10, 1873. Macdonald to Chisholm, Aug. 18, 1873. The mortgage with affidavits was completed the next month.

fact that Macdonald was approached was in a very real sense a tribute to his position vis-à-vis the worker and no doubt his name came easily to mind when the proprietors of the *Workman* were seeking financial aid. No evidence has yet been brought to light to suggest that Macdonald brought pressure to bear upon the journal to pursue a policy sympathetic to his party or that the fact of the loan itself was in any way a barrier to frank and honest discussion of labour problems in the *Workman's* columns.

Moreover, on the day the notice appeared, a lead editorial was published entitled, "Our Present Position and Future Duty." The purpose of the editorial was to review labour's achievements to date and to exhort trade unionists to devote their energies to further improve the social and economic standards of their class. In the course of the editorial, the new managers promised to pursue an independent course and stated that:

It is not for a moment to be supposed that because Sir John Macdonald's Government has received our support during the late contest that we view his administration as being in every way perfect. Nay, we are prepared to agitate for reforms that the Prime Minister himself has publicly admitted the necessity for, and expressed his willingness to devote future attention to, and receive with an impartial disposition any considerations that may from time to time emanate from the industrial classes. From the Reform Party we received no such promises, and even if inducements had been presented, we could not but feel timid in placing faith in a party over which our friend George Brown wields such an influence.<sup>64</sup>

For several weeks after this moderate statement, hardly a political word was uttered in the editorial columns of the *Workman*. And when the controversies over Liberal legislation on labour problems ensued, there was an obvious attempt to report fairly the majority views of the organized movement at the same time that the minority opinions were printed.<sup>65</sup>

All in all, it would appear that Macdonald himself when providing financial assistance to his would-be friends was far more scrupulous than many of his party's wealthier backers and that Williams, who was to contribute much to the labour movement as the years rolled on, was less corruptible than his impetuous, over-zealous behaviour in 1872 might lead an observer to believe. What is most significant for our purposes, however, is that by the end of 1872 Tory and worker were so closely related that, faced with financial difficulties, the owners of the trade unions' leading journal looked to the leader of the Conservative party, who in turn was prepared to meet their request. And to the extent that corruption of this sort can be said to exist in Canada today,

<sup>64</sup>*Ontario Workman*, Sept. 5, 1872.

<sup>65</sup>See *ibid.*, for the month of March, 1873. In February, the Grit, O'Donoghue, had moved a vote of thanks to the *Workman* for its independence.

its antecedents would appear to date from the time the trade union movement first had to deal with the party system—that is from the very beginning of both institutions.

The coincidence of the uproar over the Pacific Scandal with the panic of 1873 unexpectedly altered this relationship. The bonds of union between Macdonald and the workingman were not so firmly tied as to withstand the change of government at Ottawa or to resist the worst effects of economic depression. The years between 1873 and 1878, therefore, though never quite as dramatic as the earlier seventies, are none the less of considerable interest. The period of the temporary decline of the Conservative party and the equally temporary ascendancy of the Liberals will be remembered also as a time of great hardship for the labour movement.

With legislation legalizing trade unions and with workingmen's supporters and representatives on local councils and at least one worker in the Dominion Parliament, the trade union movement had, by 1872, reached the height of its strength. Labour interest in politics had grown enormously. During these halcyon election days trade unionists had formed a number of political or semi-political organizations such as the Workingmen's Progressive Political Party (London), the Canadian Labour Protective and Mutual Improvement Association (Hamilton), and the Workingmen's Election Club (Toronto). No doubt these were in part the Canadian expression of labour's attempts in Britain and the United States to found their own political party. But they were also the result of the growing maturity of a movement which by 1873 was sufficiently advanced to establish a central national institution, the Canadian Labour Union.<sup>66</sup> However, by the time the C.L.U. was founded, the full force of the depression had hit the labour movement rendering obsolete their network of unions and crippling the programme of expansion which prosperity had made possible. In the circumstances, labour needed all the protection it could muster. Issues like the repeal of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and adjustments in the statutes affecting such matters as mechanic's liens assumed major proportions for a movement faced with terrible insecurity. Trade unionists wanted more and indeed fought for more, but much of their effort was channelled into a programme that, if successful, would allow them simply to maintain their gains.

There was little to be hoped for from Macdonald, although there appears to have been some possibility of his amending the Criminal Law Amendment Act had he retained power. However, judging from his reluctance to extend the franchise and adopt the secret ballot, he

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*, May 9 and 23, June 20, Aug. 1, 1872; Leslie E. Wismer, comp., *Proceedings of the Canadian Labour Union, 1873-77* (Montreal, 1951); Logan, *Trade Unions*, 43-7.

was now far from amiable where labour interests were concerned. He was preoccupied with the problems political defeat would bring—with the danger to Canada of Reform policies which he believed differed greatly from his own. This aloofness, therefore, must be placed alongside the reality of the political situation in which he found himself and the character of the elections he was likely to be facing soon.<sup>67</sup> As Professor Creighton has stated, by this time "Macdonald knew that the end had come." And indeed, in April, 1873 the Opposition began the barrage which was to lead to the famous Royal Commission, Macdonald's resignation, and a Mackenzie government. The *Ontario Workman* gave their silent partner stern warning:

The Dominion Parliament, now in session, if they wish to retain popular opinion on their side, must mete out no subterfuge enactments to the producing classes; and we hope that the Trades' Unions Bill of last session will receive the prompt attention of the Government, and that obnoxious attachment to the bill that we have alluded to before, when the measure was before Parliament, known as the Criminal Amendment Act, will be repealed as nothing short of the expunging of this iniquitous and degrading amendment will satisfy the operatives of Canada.<sup>68</sup>

But history, was not to permit Sir John the privilege of repealing the Act he had himself passed, and labour turned to the leaders of the Liberal party for remedial legislation.

The effectiveness of labour's attack on Brown and the futility of the *Globe's* defence, seen in the light of the election results of 1872, appear to have had a somewhat salutary effect on the Reform party. The *Globe*, reviewing the year's events on January 1, 1873, included in its reminiscences a reminder that "this year will also be remembered as having witnessed the failure of the printers' strike in Toronto and a too transparent attempt of the Minister of Justice to make political capital of that ill-starred occurrence." No one would deny Brown his pleasure in taking credit for this anti-labour victory. Having stated his opinion, however, Brown rarely if ever referred to capital-labour relations again in the course of the year.<sup>69</sup> But if neither party in Ottawa seemed especially interested in labour's problems, the same could not be said for the Liberals of Ontario.

During the 1870's the Liberals were still very much an Ontario party and it was in the Ontario legislature that they made a concerted effort to turn back the tide of anti-Reform feeling which had previously swept

<sup>67</sup>*Ontario Workman*, March 20, 1873. Macdonald was far removed from Disraeli's social ideas when it came to trusting the population with manhood suffrage and a secret vote. See Macdonald Papers, 521, Macdonald to Lord Carnarvon (private), Sept. 5, 1872; *Ontario Workman*, March 27, April 10, 1873.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, March 6, 1873.

<sup>69</sup>*Globe*, Jan. 1, 1873. Brown's silence is certainly curious in the light of the Ontario legislation of February and March.

through the labour movement. Important legislation affecting labour was introduced in the middle of January, 1873.<sup>70</sup> On the surface, the bills presented seemed to reflect a serious desire on the part of the Ontario Reform leaders to undo some of the damage caused by Brown and his friends and to face up to a number of injustices about which the labour movement had long complained. The Liberal social programme, however, also reflected haste and a lack of understanding of the workingman's needs, and it attracted a great deal of sharp criticism from labour. But this criticism was not unanimous and it was occasionally tempered with recognition that the Liberals were at last endeavouring to move in the right direction. Even the *Ontario Workman* which had mercilessly and ceaselessly attacked the worst aspects of the legislation admitted on March 6 that "The Local Legislature have entered very largely into questions that are considered workingmen's questions, and though we cannot fully endorse the enactments of that body, it shows that the necessity of such legislation is recognized by the powers that be at Toronto, and at the next session of the Ontario Legislature we may look for and expect many useful amendments to those workingmen's questions that will become law."<sup>71</sup>

Labour's success with the provincial Liberals, though limited, was soon to have an effect upon the federal party. On April 13, 1874, the recently elected Liberal member for Witton's former constituency in Hamilton, Aemilius E. Irving, tabled a question in the House enquiring whether there was any possibility of the Government's amending the Criminal Law Amendment Act. Replying for the Government, Antoine A. Dorion stated that "pending the report of Mr. Disraeli's commission on the subject, the government did not intend to introduce a measure to repeal that Act."<sup>72</sup> Irving, not satisfied with the answer, a few weeks later managed to persuade a reluctant Government to set up a select committee to consider the changes necessary in the existing act. The committee reported in short order: the act should be amended to remove any possibility of unjust treatment but any legislative action should be postponed until the next session when the Royal Commission in England would have presented its report at Westminster.

<sup>70</sup>*Journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario*, 2nd Session, 1873, 29 ff.

<sup>71</sup>*Ontario Workman*, Jan. 30; Feb. 6, 13, 27, 28, 1873; *Ontario Statutes*, 1873, 17-31; *Journals of Ontario*, 1873, 28, 88, 100, 115. Mass meetings of workingmen were held in Toronto on February 11, 1873, with trade union representatives from Ottawa and Hamilton participating, and at Hamilton on February 28, 1873, to protest legislation and pass a resolution condemning the inadequacy of the bills submitted. *Ontario Workman*, Feb. 13, March 6, 1873. The Reform trade unionists attempted to disrupt the Hamilton meeting but failed. However, this brought to the public notice the political divisions in the movement. *Ibid.*, March 6, 13, 20, 27, 1873.

<sup>72</sup>P.A.C., Parliamentary Debates, 1873-4 (microfilm), reel P-58, 20.

However, when the new session opened no mention of the Criminal Law Amendment Act appeared in the Throne Speech. A week later the redoubtable Irving, hard pressed by the Canadian Labour Union, introduced a bill to repeal the act relating to violence, threats, and molestation. His reasons for asking that the 1872 act be removed altogether was that the British report as it turned out had satisfied no one and the existing law in Canada "was considered obnoxious to numbers of his own constituents, and also to constituents of his hon. friend from West Toronto who, fearing that the subject might be shelved in England," wanted it brought up in Canada. The House could always legislate later, if necessary, on the basis of the decisions yet to be arrived at in Britain.<sup>73</sup>

Within six weeks Irving's bill came up for its second reading. The economic depression which was to last for the greater part of the next generation was well under way in Canada and the weakened trade union movement was thus unusually sensitive on the question of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and especially anxious that the threat implied by the law of 1872 be removed. In a short speech in the House, Irving reviewed the history of the 1872 Act and appealed to the Government to support its repeal. He explained that workingmen's meetings in Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, and St. Catharines had without exception approved of his bill. They wanted the old Act repealed.<sup>74</sup>

It was now the Government's turn. They had been driven into a most embarrassing position. The supporters of Brown in their party would never swallow "repeal." Yet, to reject out of hand legislation suggested by two of their own supporters to whom the working class was looking for aid might alienate the labour movement from the Liberal party for an indefinite period. Across the way sat Macdonald, the workingman's friend, waiting. Télesphore Fournier rose to speak for the Liberal administration. In a fortnight the session would be over; perhaps he could slip the Government off the hook until then. He spoke for only a few minutes but when he sat down it was impossible to tell from his skilful double-talk whether he was for the Act of 1872 concerning violence, or for its repeal. It appeared that while he was in general sympathy with the workers' cause he was against the bill at this particular time. At least, he was for a similar bill, only some time later on, and after more careful consideration of the subject. There was, he felt, too little time to come to a decision now.<sup>75</sup>

Irving would have none of this. He warned the Government in one short sharp sentence that the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1872

<sup>73</sup>The House opened on February 4, 1875. *Debates*, 1875, 1-3, 35; Wismer, *Proceedings of the C.L.U.*, 21, 27.

<sup>74</sup>*Debates*, 1875, 898-903.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, 903-4.

had been introduced and passed through all its stages in one day: "Therefore the working-men would say that if it was reasonable to pass such a law in one day, the same Parliament could devise a remedial measure in the eight or ten days left us." He made his own position clear. The Government must give their solemn pledge to bring in a bill at once based on the legislation called for by labour's friends in Britain or he would be forced to insist upon his bill and expose the Liberal Government's policy. Macdonald was still waiting. There was a pause in the debate. Finally a somewhat deflated Fournier stood up. He replied that while he had not had the time to examine Sir William Harcourt's bill he believed he could undertake what Irving desired. Irving apparently had won; but he was not a gambler. He had a healthy distrust of the Front Bench. He insisted that his bill be read the second time on the understanding that when the Liberal Minister of Justice did finally introduce his legislation, Irving would then be happy to drop his own. At this point Blake called for an adjournment.<sup>76</sup>

Three days later Fournier gave notice of a bill to amend the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and on April 1 he moved the second reading. It was at this point that Mackenzie, who had remained curiously silent throughout the debate, refusing to offer the House the benefit of a mason's word on this labour issue, decided he might have a little fun with the old, scarred chieftain. It was a dangerous game he was playing, but he plodded blindly on. "The only objection he had to this Bill was that it deprived his right hon. friend from Kingston of his laurels of 1872." "I have had my laurels," Macdonald snapped back. Moss was on his feet. He was an independent Liberal from a constituency that would always respect Macdonald for the steps he took in 1872 to protect trade unions. "He was not disposed to find very much fault with the right hon. member from Kingston" though he was even more pleased that the Liberals had amended the injustices of his Act.<sup>77</sup>

Macdonald, it was true, had had his laurels, and was going to keep them, if he could. In trying, he hardly needed the protection of Moss. Macdonald reminded the House how he had won his pre-eminence in this sphere. He recalled the defence of the worker against "the harsh treatment of a certain prominent gentleman," and pointed out that he might have done more in 1872 and not included the second bill had it not been essential "to prevent any possibility of opposition being made to the law on the ground that it went further than the English Act." But he was not really interested in either defending his just behaviour or needling the Government for allowing themselves to be

<sup>76</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>77</sup>*Debates*, 1875, 928, 1035.

imprisoned by Brown's hostile attitude to unions. It was Irving's working class supporters he was after. As for "the Liberals being entitled to any credit for this measure," Macdonald believed "the whole credit was due to his honourable friend from Hamilton who, in anticipation of having to go back to his constituents after the prorogation of the House, felt called upon to press this measure upon the Government." He then chided the Liberals for their reluctance to go further to meet labour's demands. "It was true that the Government did not go so far as his honourable friend had proposed, but they had, no doubt with his own honourable friend, accepted the Bill on the principle that a half-loaf was better than no bread. He hoped that the honourable gentleman will tell his constituents that when he came back to this house next Session, as he no doubt would, he would seek to obtain repeal even of this Act."<sup>78</sup>

The Bill received royal assent on April 8, almost three years to the day after Police Magistrate MacNabb, prodded by George Brown, had issued twenty-four warrants for the arrest of the most militant leaders of Toronto Typographical Union No. 91. As the result of mounting pressure from the trade unions and their few friends in the House,<sup>79</sup> the Act was improved the following session and though many trade unionists preferred to see the Act repealed, the 1876 Congress of the Canadian Labour Union went so far as to carry unanimously a vote of thanks for the "efforts of the Hon. Edward Blake in securing the changes he suitably recognized."<sup>80</sup>

But labour by then was too weak to inspire any fundamental change in the attitude of indifference displayed by both national parties toward social legislation. The economic depression which hung over the industrial world, threatening and dampening all enterprise and flooding the urban centres with goods few could afford, was taking its toll in Canada. Workingmen's incomes had been grievously slashed and while the greatest fall in wage rates may have been found in those areas where trade unions were crippled or unknown, there were few signs of industrial workers seeking solace and protection through

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.*, 1036.

<sup>79</sup>Wisner, *Proceedings of the C.L.U.*, 45, 48, 51. Moss once told Alfred Jury (the Socialist and future President of the C.L.U.) "that when he had made a speech on Mr. Irving's Bill he had never seen so little interest shown by the other Members of the House, although many of them had a considerable proportion of workingmen among their constituents."

<sup>80</sup>*Debates*, 1876, 65, 85, 462. Wisner, *Proceedings of the C.L.U.*, 66. One can only assume that the labour movement as yet was blind to the attitude of Mackenzie to the Belleville strike which had just begun. If there be any doubt as to the lack of sympathy on the part of leading Liberals to the trade union movement, Mackenzie's correspondence for this period, especially on the Belleville strike issue, provides adequate proof of their deep distrust of working class needs and actions. F.A.C., Mackenzie Papers, Mackenzie to Joseph Hickson, Jan. 7, 1877.

regenerated trade union organizations. The Canadian Labour Union, for example, could not muster more than seventeen delegates to its annual Congress in August, 1877; its one labour representative in Parliament no longer held the confidence of the trade union movement, while the C.L.U. itself was almost evenly split into Conservative and Liberal factions. Not one of the many major pieces of labour legislation the unions had been calling for since 1873 had been placed upon the statute books. Nor had they been successful in electing any number of their own representatives in Parliament. Their victories were to be found in the few amendments they had persuaded the Liberals to attach to the legislation respecting violence and to the Masters and Servants Act, and in the extent to which immigration had been limited. Their weakness was probably most evident in 1877 when, having won very little from Liberal administrations, the C.L.U. again passed a resolution unanimously, stating "That the best thanks of this Congress are due and are hereby tendered to the Honourable Edward Blake, Minister of Justice, for the action he has taken on the laws affecting labour in general, and the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Masters and Servants Act in particular, in spite of the opposition of the capitalist classes of the Dominion." Even the *Globe* was thanked for its full reports of the Congress.<sup>81</sup>

These expressions of gratitude, however, ought not to be interpreted as merely reflecting a change of heart on the part of trade unionists in response to a more generous Reform policy toward labour. Indeed, a few days after the C.L.U. Congress, George Brown's *Globe* was thundering against several of the resolutions adopted at the meeting, and characterized the trade unions as "safety-valves by which [their] pent-up aspirations . . . are relieved. . . ." The public need not fear the resolutions passed at such meetings, said the *Globe*, for "even if these be not adopted, their authors not only feel no sense of injustice, but are often well satisfied that they have been the subject of public discussion."<sup>82</sup> Brown realized how weak the labour movement had become; so did Blake.

The breaches of contracts bill which Blake guided through the House in 1877 was meant to supersede existing provincial Master and Servants Acts. Workers were criminally liable for breaches which the Liberal Minister of Justice felt might more reasonably be dealt with in the civil courts. Furthermore, he hoped his bill would help to establish equality before the law, as between capital and labour, when claims of a breach of contract occurred. In fact, Blake's Act, when examined, proved to be substantially different. While it did transfer

<sup>81</sup>Wisner, *Proceedings of the C.L.U.*, 91.

<sup>82</sup>*Globe*, Aug. 15, 1877.

certain minor breaches of agreement from criminal to civil jurisdiction it also stipulated three areas that would continue to be regarded as criminal. The most important of the three was a breach of contract "on the part of employes on railways. . . ." The Opposition, led by independent Liberals like Irving and prominent Conservatives like Tupper and Macdonald, condemned Blake's bill as nothing less than anti-labour class legislation bound to irritate trade unionists and aggravate the struggle between capital and labour. At best, in their view, the Liberal bill was destined to prove a useless weapon against strikes affecting essential public utilities in the community. Blake's critics in the House saw what the Toronto Trades Assembly and the Canadian Labour Union failed to notice: that the Reformers were merely introducing legislation to cover their Government's ineffectualness during the Grand Trunk Railway strike and, with the end of the strike, to blame the locomotive engineers by restricting their freedom to strike in the future. In the circumstances, one is forced to view the tribute paid Blake by the C.L.U. in 1877 as an expression of labour's weakness rather than a fundamental change in the political sympathy of the trade union leaders.<sup>83</sup>

Thus, the seventies, which began with the open alliance of a relatively strong, closely knit, labour movement with the Tory party ended with a deeply divided and weak movement paying tribute to the Grit leaders. Labour played no role to speak of in the elections of 1878, and no longer received the recognition it had enjoyed as a political force in the community in 1872-3.<sup>84</sup> In 1872 most trade unionists supported the party of Sir John A. Macdonald; by 1878 labour, ignoring the odd appeals from Liberal leaders, was grimly determined to have its own representatives in the legislative halls of the country. Party attitudes as well as economic conditions had strengthened the movement's determination to elect independent candidates—to have in Ottawa spokesmen of the working class itself.

<sup>83</sup>P.A.C. Blake Papers (microfilm), General Canadian political correspondence, March-April, 1877. *Debates*, 1877, 524-5, 855-74, 1010-19, 1054, 1897. *S.P.*, 1877, no. 55. *Globe*, Jan. 1, 3, 4, 20, 1877. A. W. Currie, *The Grand Trunk Railway of Canada* (Toronto, 1957), 152-4. Masters, *Toronto*, 149. P.A.C., Minutes of the meetings of the Toronto Trades and Labour Council and the Toronto Trades Assembly (microfilm), reel (M-304-5), March 21, April 17, 1877, 324, 329.

<sup>84</sup>Macdonald made no special effort to attract the artisan vote and judging from the political campaign speeches of the ministers in 1877, the Liberals too did not consider the labour vote as of major importance. See *Reform Government in the Dominion, the Pic-Nic Speeches by Mackenzie, Blake, Cartwright, Huntington, Mills of 1877* (Toronto, 1878).

## Mackenzie and His Cabinet, 1873-1878

SISTER TERESA AVILA BURKE

"I HAVE NO SINECURE in trying to keep together a crowd of French Liberals Irish Catholics Methodists Free Traders Protectionists Eastern Province men Western Men Central Canada men Columbians Manitobans all jealous of each other and striving to obtain some advantage or concession. I always knew it was very hard to keep liberals together but my experience has been far in excess of my utmost belief."<sup>1</sup> This plaintive remark of Alexander Mackenzie has found an echo in the life of every Canadian prime minister, who, upon coming to office, is deluged with suggestions and pleas for the appointment of this or that favourite son to the cabinet. Too frequently, he has had to overlook men of talent because he is bound by constitutional convention to form a cabinet representative of the various provinces and special interest groups within the country. As Christopher Dunkin had predicted during the Confederation debates in 1865, since "the provinces are not really represented to any Federal intent in the Legislative Council" the cabinet would have to be constructed on the federal principle; that is, it would have to be "distinctly representative of the Provinces."<sup>2</sup>

Forming a cabinet that would represent the divergent regional, provincial, sectional, religious, and ethnic interests of this centrifugal, pluralistic Canadian society was no easy task and it became increasingly difficult as divisive issues split up parties into warring factions. Obviously, only a strong prime minister, a manipulator of men, could bring and hold together a team representing such conflicting forces. Fortunately for Canada, Sir John A. Macdonald was such a man. By the end of his first administration, the role of the cabinet as the coordinator and conciliator of the diverse interests of the Canadian people had been well established.

<sup>1</sup>Public Archives of Canada, Mackenzie Papers, Mackenzie to Charles, Oct. 20, 1876.

<sup>2</sup>*Parliamentary Debates on the Subject of Confederation of the British North American Provinces* (Quebec, 1865), 497.

In constructing his first cabinet, Macdonald had purposely formed a coalition of those who, irrespective of party, had favoured Confederation and represented majorities within the provinces. As political exigencies led to changes of ministers and the shuffling of seats, there emerged an equilibrium of interests which assumed the nature of a precedent in the forming of future cabinets during the first era of Confederation. With some modifications, this pattern has continued in force until the present. For instance, the basis of representation of the provinces was regional, with the thirteen (sometimes fourteen or fifteen) ministers almost equally divided among three regions—five seats for Ontario, four for Quebec, and four for the Maritimes. Ontario had one more than Quebec in deference to her greater population and wealth and Ontario politicians insisted time and again on a recognition of this primacy. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick jealously guarded their right to two seats each but this precedent was broken in 1896 when Laurier awarded only one seat to New Brunswick. At times the smallest province, Prince Edward Island, was without representation but she never ceased to clamour for it. The West's demand for representation was met in 1888. In addition to this regional and provincial representation, the cultural individuality of the French was safeguarded by three French Catholics, while the Irish Roman Catholics had one representative. The English-speaking Protestants of Quebec, a minority, had a representative from the Eastern Townships. Protestant sects and national strains in the population, such as the English and Scottish, were represented among the other members.

When the interim Liberal leader, Alexander Mackenzie, assumed Macdonald's post, the highly diplomatic nature of the prime minister's role became painfully clear. The exact antithesis of Macdonald, Mackenzie was righteous and rigid where Macdonald was down to earth and conciliatory. Everybody admired Mackenzie's integrity, his "unswerving rectitude, his truthfulness, and his indomitable energy";<sup>3</sup> but his righteousness antagonized many people—he was "certain that the Tories had inherited most of Adam's original sin"<sup>4</sup> and one of his contemporaries tells us that "It was said that Sir John could refuse the request of a deputation with better grace than Mackenzie could grant what was asked."<sup>5</sup>

Mackenzie was handicapped from the outset by finding himself at the head of a party that was federal in name only. Although elected leader of the Liberal party in the House of Commons<sup>6</sup> he had in effect to share that leadership since, according to Cartwright, the leadership

<sup>3</sup>Montreal Morning Chronicle, July 6, 1874.

<sup>4</sup>O. D. Skelton, *Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier* (2 vols., New York, 1922), I, 222.

<sup>5</sup>G. W. Ross, *Getting into Parliament and After* (Toronto, 1913), 222.

<sup>6</sup>Montreal Morning Chronicle, March 7, 1873.

of the Liberals was for all practical purposes in commission, with Blake, Holton, Dorion, and Mackenzie all playing a relatively equal role in directing strategy.<sup>7</sup> The Liberal provincial parties and, to a lesser extent, the Conservative party were still in a state of flux and primarily sectional in interest. Confederation had been carried by a coalition of those who favoured it and were powerful enough in their respective provinces to carry majorities with them. The Anti-Confederates gradually came to be known as Liberals. Since they represented sectional factions, they lost their principal bond of unity in 1867 and no Liberal leader had as yet appeared who could weld them into a national party or devise a platform that would attract the voters. The election of 1874 was a Conservative defeat rather than a Liberal victory.

In Ontario, the stronghold of Canadian liberalism, the Clear Grits and Constitutionals had united to oust the Sandfield Macdonald provincial government in 1871 but party lines had not been completely obliterated. Mackenzie was marked as a friend and follower of George Brown, while Blake had many loyal supporters. Mackenzie was the recognized although not undisputed leader of the provincial Liberal party. Indeed there were some who thought that Blake should have succeeded to the national leadership when he surrendered the premiership of the Ontario government and they were never reconciled to the Mackenzie leadership.<sup>8</sup> The place which Blake held in the Liberal party may be gauged by the uncertainty during the few days before the formation of the Government over the identity of the new leader. *La Gazette du Sorel* speaks of Blake as "le premier homme de l'opposition"<sup>9</sup> and there had been occasional rumours of his taking over the premiership.<sup>10</sup>

To represent Ontario Edward Blake was, therefore, not only a logical but a necessary choice for the Cabinet. Yet, Mackenzie had a difficult time securing his adherence to the Government in 1873. In a letter to Cartwright, Blake had written: "I have no objection to say to you for your own information exclusively that my determination is fixed not to go in just now. I do not see how it is *possible* for me to do so. If there were (which there are not) reasons making my presence in a new administration of vital consequence, I would only come in as one of the council without office."<sup>11</sup>

Blake has always been a baffling personality. Everyone recognized

<sup>7</sup>Richard Cartwright, *Reminiscences* (Toronto, 1912), 124.

<sup>8</sup>John Stephen Willison, *Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal Party: A Political History* (2 vols., London, 1930), I, 248.

<sup>9</sup>Nov. 5, 1873.

<sup>10</sup>P.A.C., Macdonald Papers, 19, Macdonald to Cartier, March 7, 1873.

<sup>11</sup>Ontario Archives, Cartwright Papers, Blake to Cartwright, Aug. 25, 1873.

his towering intellectual ability but very few ever understood him. Even his colleagues were never certain of his attitude toward them and the party. High-strung, nervous, and extremely sensitive to all manner of opinion, he had built up a reserve that kept him aloof from all but his most intimate friends. Sincerely interested in good government and enthusiastic in his support of a number of causes, he never cared for the game of politics—probably because he was incapable of playing it. He seems to have been torn between the wishes of his friends and his own inclinations: between a political career and his successful legal practice.

Blake was not a man to follow another and his perfunctory support of Mackenzie proved a constant embarrassment to the Prime Minister. It was no doubt only the pressure of his party that brought him into the Cabinet. There is among the Blake papers a petition dated November 6, 1873 and signed by one hundred and four of the Liberal members of both the House and Senate urging him to join the Cabinet "in order to give the weight of your name to strengthen it in Parliament and before the country."<sup>12</sup>

From Ontario there also came Richard Cartwright. Formerly a Conservative, then an Independent, his conversion to the Liberal party was complete. He became the party's stalwart defender of reciprocity and an outstanding leader. D. A. Macdonald, a Scottish Roman Catholic and old-time Liberal, or perhaps, more accurately, "an eastern Ontario 'wobbler'"<sup>13</sup> was a popular politician and railroad man. Richard Scott had formerly given support to Sir John A. Macdonald, but had joined the Liberal provincial administration of Edward Blake in 1871. He brought the support of the Irish Roman Catholics of Ontario with him. David Christie, another Scot, probably chosen to represent the old radical Grit element in the party, completed the Ontario contingent.

Scanning the potential cabinet material in Quebec, Mackenzie's freedom of choice was limited by the division of the Liberal party into a small radical group, the Rouges, who stemmed from the earlier Parti Rouge, an anti-clerical party of the continental liberal type, and a more numerous moderate group, who looked rather to British constitutional practice. The Rouges had alienated some of the hierarchy, specifically the influential bishops of Montreal and Three Rivers,

<sup>12</sup>It is signed by men such as D. A. Macdonald, Holton, Geoffrion, Coffin, Mills, Laurier, Edgar, Mercier, Burpee, Letellier, Laird, Cauchon. See also Ontario Archives, Blake Papers, Goldwin Smith to Blake, Nov. 6, 1873. Cartwright says "It is but fair to say that a majority of the Liberal party would have preferred to see him premier." *Reminiscences*, 134.

<sup>13</sup>Escott M. Reid, "The Rise of National Parties in Canada," Canadian Political Science Association, *Papers and Proceedings*, IV, 1932, 196.

Bourget and Laflèche, by their insistence on freedom of thought. Concerned over growing Protestant influence in Quebec, these bishops encouraged the development of an ultra-Catholic wing within the Conservative party, the *Programmistes*, so called because of the "Catholic Programme" which they issued in April, 1871. The programme declared allegiance to the Conservative party and urged its followers to vote Conservative so long as the Conservative candidates accepted their programme. Archbishop Taschereau, the pro-Liberal bishop of Quebec, condemned this attempt to form a Catholic party but many of the clergy supported it. To neutralize clerical displeasure, Louis Jetté and some of the more moderate Liberals had conceived a new party—*le parti national*—Liberal but in no way connected with the Rouge element. Outside of Jetté's victory over Sir George Cartier in Montreal East in the general elections of 1872, however, it never developed any strength; and *le parti national* does not seem to have figured largely in Mackenzie's calculations. Instead, the Rouge element was predominate in his choice of ministers.

First among the French-speaking Liberal leaders of the province stood Antoine Aimé Dorion, a natural choice for the Cabinet. Téléphore Fournier, another leader of the Parti Rouge and one of the editors of *Le National*, the Liberal newspaper, was in Holton's opinion "the ablest and most influential man of our party in the district of Quebec"<sup>14</sup> but he was to compromise the Government by too frequent inebriation. The third French member to be selected, Luc Letellier de St. Just, had been active in pre-Confederation Quebec politics and a member of the Senate since 1867, where he continued to remain as Government leader.

Mackenzie was not able to settle the matter of a fourth seat for Quebec until the following January.<sup>15</sup> At that time, Lucius Seth Huntington, an English-speaking resident of the Eastern Townships, joined the Government to represent that group. Luther Holton would perhaps have been a stronger addition. Proprietor of the Montreal *Herald* and a founder of the Rouge party, he rose to a position of influence in the Liberal party because of his business ability and knowledge of commercial affairs. It was common knowledge that he had been offered a seat in the Mackenzie administration and refused,<sup>16</sup> but the corre-

<sup>14</sup>Montreal Gazette, July 13, 1874. Also, Mackenzie to Jones, Nov. 27, 1874, in "Letters of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie to Hon. A. G. Jones 1869-85," *Report of the Board of Trustees of the Public Archives of Nova Scotia*, 1952, 46.

<sup>15</sup>The *Globe* in listing the members of the Cabinet according to the province from which they came noted "one seat vacant" under Quebec—an indication of the already settled practice of balancing Ontario's contingent of five with at least four Quebecers. *Globe*, Nov. 7, 1873.

<sup>16</sup>Quebec Morning Chronicle, Jan. 17, 1874.

spondence in Mackenzie's letterbook during 1874-6 clearly indicates that Holton's answer in 1873 was considered final neither by Holton nor Mackenzie.<sup>17</sup> Willison suggested that Mackenzie's choice of Huntington was determined by extraneous circumstances. Huntington was under fire from the Conservative party for his role in the Pacific Scandal and failure to choose him might have been interpreted as a repudiation of him. Holton, who was not anxious for a portfolio at the moment, agreed to this arrangement.<sup>18</sup>

Ontario and Quebec were, of course, the pivotal provinces but the support from the Maritimes and the West had tipped the scales in Macdonald's favour in the federal victory in 1872. It behooved Mackenzie to control the Maritimes but this he was unable to do primarily because of the absence of organized Liberal parties in this region. In Nova Scotia, the Confederates formed a wing of the national Conservative party from the outset, but the anti-Confederates joined with the national Liberal party only after the victory of the Liberal party in 1874.<sup>19</sup> In Prince Edward Island, Laird's own paper, the *Patriot*, said as late as 1876: "We Islanders owe no fealty to Macdonald, and we are not bound by strong party ties to Mackenzie. Both these leaders are to us almost abstractions, and we are in a position to judge them by their acts as statesmen, independent of personal considerations."<sup>20</sup>

In the months preceding the fall of the Macdonald administration, Mackenzie was concerned only with bringing an end to the Conservative régime. As he wrote to Cartwright in September 1873, "I have adopted party organization as a means to an end, that end being a change of policy in the Government and on many grounds a change of administration. I am not particular whether the changes sought is [sic] obtained by a pure party vote or not, and nothing would give me greater pleasure than to cooperate with others calling themselves conservative to ensure success and to give these gentlemen all my assistance at an election afterwards."<sup>21</sup> Is it any wonder that the material from which he had to choose had its drawbacks?

The men whom Mackenzie appointed from Nova Scotia—William Ross and Thomas Coffin—had been, if not Conservatives, at least followers of Sir John A. Macdonald.<sup>22</sup> The *Halifax Reporter* commented that "It would be difficult to search the Province through and

<sup>17</sup>P.A.C., Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Holton, Feb. 4, 9, 1876.

<sup>18</sup>Willison, *Laurier and the Liberal Party*, I, 270-1.

<sup>19</sup>J. A. Beck, "The Party System in Nova Scotia," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, XX, (Nov., 1954), 517.

<sup>20</sup>F. Mackinnon, "David Laird of Prince Edward Island," *Dalhousie Review*, XXVII (winter, 1947), 414.

<sup>21</sup>Cartwright Papers, Mackenzie to Cartwright, Sept. 4, 1873.

<sup>22</sup>Montreal Gazette, Sept. 29, 1874; *Globe*, June 12, 1873.

find two such men in every way qualified to make poorer Cabinet Ministers than Messrs. Ross and Coffin. . . ."<sup>23</sup> That Ross was not an asset to the Government, Mackenzie very shortly admitted in rather strong language to Blake. "The man's an ass and I wonder we never knew it with six years' knowledge of him."<sup>24</sup> Coffin came to be "utterly useless" and since he was unco-operative about resigning, the Prime Minister thought about legislating out of existence his office of Receiver General. This would "dispose of him."<sup>25</sup>

Why Mackenzie was unable to bring A. G. Jones in, is not clear. Jones had been considered Howe's strongest opponent in the province<sup>26</sup> and his accession would have brought needed strength to the Cabinet. The two men were very good friends but Mackenzie was not one to press a friend to sacrifice himself for the party and in this instance, Jones' business interests would probably have suffered.

Mackenzie had better results from his negotiations with the New Brunswick delegation, although the *St. John News* thought that neither Isaac Burpee nor Albert Smith could come up to Peter Mitchell or Samuel Tilley. "New Brunswick's influence in the Mackenzie Cabinet is not nearly so strong as in the Macdonald administration."<sup>27</sup> Burpee, though a Liberal, had given independent support to the Government of Sir John Macdonald until its fall in November, 1873 when he became an opponent of it. Although Smith had been head of the provincial Wilmot-Smith Government in 1865, he had not been unalterably opposed to Confederation, a fact which made his and his party's position unreal in the "contest" with Tilley.<sup>28</sup> After 1867 he held aloof from both parties so that while his was a respected name, he did not command as much support as a cabinet minister should.

In his attempt to line up men for the forthcoming attack on the Government in the summer and fall of 1873, Mackenzie had looked to Prince Edward Island where the House of Commons candidates were pledged to neither party. He requested A. J. Smith in September to see David Laird. He thought he had won him over and that Laird and his friends would join the Liberals if elected but they were "fresh to politics . . . and bore watching." As Secretary of State for Canada, Laird was accused of having sold himself to the Liberals for a seat in the Cabinet, but this charge seems unwarranted. The Liberals

<sup>23</sup>Quoted in the *Ottawa Daily Citizen*, Nov. 19, 1873.

<sup>24</sup>Ontario Archives, Blake Papers, Mackenzie to Blake, Jan. 4, 1874.

<sup>25</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Jones, Jan. 2, 1877.

<sup>26</sup>Mackenzie to Jones, May 10, 1869, "Letters of Mackenzie to Jones 1869-85."

<sup>27</sup>Quoted in *Ottawa Daily Citizen*, Nov. 13, 1873.

<sup>28</sup>Escott Reid quotes the *St. John Daily Telegraph*, Aug. 2, 1872 as saying that Smith had "declared at his nomination meeting that he had said to Sir J. A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier that even if he had the power he would not turn them out for the sake of office for he thought no other could do better than they." Reid, "Rise of National Parties," 196.

elected to the House for Prince Edward Island were elected not as strong party men but as supporters of Mackenzie in his opposition to Macdonald. Actually, Laird took little part in the proceedings of the House of Commons probably because he was so lacking in experience with federal politics.

At the moment there was no clamouring in British Columbia for a seat in the cabinet. The *Daily British Colonist* let it be known that British Columbia's federal political creed might be summed up in the statement: The Terms of Union.<sup>29</sup> British Columbia would support any government that fulfilled the really important terms of Union—the building of the railroad.

That this cabinet was nondescript and lacking in executive ability seems to have been the contemporary opinion, and history has not altered the verdict. The formal announcement of the new Government on November 7, 1873 called forth a barrage of criticism, which although obviously partisan, has value in indicating the Government's specific weaknesses. The *Quebec Morning Chronicle* observed that "with the exception of some of the more prominent names, the members do not control the following necessary to a strong Government, while upon questions demanding early regulation there are divergencies of opinion sufficient to break up the organization."<sup>30</sup> Sir John A. Macdonald did not hesitate to call the Government a "dishonest coalition" and singled out Cartwright for his special wrath.<sup>31</sup> Laird's sudden conversion to the Liberal party could be accounted for only in terms of the "bait of office." He also questioned the presence of two ministers without portfolio in this Cabinet. He declared it unconstitutional to have two unpaid members in a cabinet and spoke of Blake and Scott as not being members at all. "What is that Government going to do without Mr. Blake, and how long will it last without a representative of Irish Catholics in it?"<sup>32</sup>

Blake's position was under particularly heavy fire. The *Montreal Gazette* declared that "no man can enter public life, that is, capable of taking a commanding position which he has taken, without accepting the full responsibilities and duties of public life. . . ."<sup>33</sup> The *Montreal Morning Chronicle* probably summarized best the arguments directed against Blake:

It is the ministerial responsibility and accountability to Parliament that forms the distinctive feature of our constitutional system of government and the very bulwark of our liberties. Any innovation affecting the conditions inseparable from

<sup>29</sup>Nov. 27, 1873.

<sup>30</sup>Nov. 8, 1873.

<sup>31</sup>*Leader*, Nov. 18, 1873.

<sup>32</sup>*Daily British Colonist*, Nov. 22, 1873.

<sup>33</sup>Nov. 8, 1873.

the responsibility of this office should be jealously watched. . . . We believe that however high a sense of honor Mr. Blake may be disposed to entertain, the consequence of giving away his personal services—services of a nature to tax his energies and patience in the highest degree—will inevitably be to diminish his active responsibility. . . . In common with many disinterested observers of passing events we are disposed to see in this securing of Mr. Blake at any price conclusive evidence of the inherent weakness of the Mackenzie Administration and an unmistakable sign of its speedy dissolution. A Government which has recourse to extraordinary expedients must have extraordinary necessities.<sup>34</sup>

The criticism continued. The *Leader* noted that that there was no Irish representative in the Cabinet and not a single Englishman while there were "no less than five or six of his own countrymen."<sup>35</sup> The inclusion of fifteen members in the Government which caused a number of unfavourable comments was defended on the basis of sectional representation: "that precedent once established and acted upon, no proposal of Cabinet Ministers has been put forward."<sup>36</sup> *La Minerve* wondered whether Dorion, Fournier, and Letellier de St. Just, representatives of Catholic interests, could "pass for as good Catholics as Langevin, Robitaille and Masson."<sup>37</sup>

Some of these shortcomings were remedied when, in January, David Christie retired. Richard Scott moved into the office of Secretary of State, and Lucius Seth Huntington came in to represent the English-speaking minority of Quebec and bring Quebec's quota up to the conventional number of four. But the whole question of Blake's position in the Government came up again when, after four short months of incumbency, he retired on February 13. There was, perhaps, some justification in the charges of implied duplicity brought against him by the Ottawa *Daily Citizen* and the Montreal *Gazette*. Both papers claimed that he had brought to the support of the Government people who were "led to assume he would share the responsibility."<sup>38</sup> The excuse offered by the *Globe* that he had joined the Government only under great pressure and for a temporary period of time seemed lame indeed.

At least as early as May, 1874, only three months after Blake's retirement, rumours were circulating about his re-entering the Government as Prime Minister. Mackenzie wrote him on May 28, "I see the 'Gazette' says you are to take my place, I wish to Heaven it were true."<sup>39</sup> Such was the discord within the Liberal party over the Pacific Scandal that a number of leading Liberals from the various provinces pressed Blake to re-enter the Cabinet or formally sever his connection

<sup>34</sup>Nov. 11, 1873; *Leader*, Nov. 8, 11, 1873.

<sup>35</sup>Nov. 21, 1873; also, Nov. 8, 1873.

<sup>36</sup>*Globe*, Nov. 11, 1873.

<sup>37</sup>Nov. 17, 1873.

<sup>38</sup>Ottawa, *Daily Citizen*, Feb. 14, 1874; see also Montreal *Gazette*, Feb. 16, 1873.

<sup>39</sup>Blake Papers, Mackenzie to Blake, May 28, 1874.

with the party.<sup>40</sup> Anxious for retrenchment in government, Blake completely disapproved of the compromise arrangement with British Columbia, the more so as it had in his opinion been forced upon Canada by Lord Carnarvon.<sup>41</sup> By September, he was willing to take Mackenzie's ejaculation of the previous May literally and informed him that if he were still of the same feeling, he would, in spite of the difficulties, "overcome my personal reluctance to office." But he assured Mackenzie that if he wished to remain Prime Minister he would "rejoice to know" that he could "without reproach retain my present position which I definitely prefer."<sup>42</sup>

Mackenzie's reply was that of a harassed, well-intentioned man who could not keep pace with all of the ramifications of managing a cabinet. If only Blake and Holton had accepted the invitations when they had been offered them! Appointment of new cabinet ministers was not a simple matter of addition. The equilibrium of interests in the Cabinet had to be maintained. When Mackenzie had failed in his attempt to obtain their services three months before he had informed the two members who would have had to retire to make place for them, D. A. Macdonald and Huntington, that they would be required to remain for another session. Having made their plans for the season, they could not now be asked to retire. Moreover, the *St. John Globe* had recently carried an article "stating very concisely the change" which Blake had suggested "as one that would soon be carried out" with "the inference that a cabal existed in the Cabinet." To carry out the programme "laid down for me" immediately, Mackenzie thought, would subject him to humiliation.<sup>43</sup> Blake's answer was the only one. "It is abundantly plain that the proposed arrangement is absolutely out of the question."<sup>44</sup>

The acceptance of the inevitable did not mean a reconciliation of views and just over a week later (October 3) the split in the Liberal party became only too evident in the speech which Blake delivered at Aurora, Ontario, in which he endorsed a good part of the platform of the Canadian National Association, the political party of Canada First formed in January, 1874. The Canada Firsters, as the name indicates, were determined to develop a nationalism above party and their political objective had become nothing less than Canadian constitutional autonomy,<sup>45</sup> a goal in which Blake fervently believed. These

<sup>40</sup>M. Ormsby, "Prime Minister Mackenzie, the Liberal Party, and the Bargain with British Columbia," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXVI (June, 1945), 148.

<sup>41</sup>Blake Papers, copy of letter from Blake to Mackenzie, April 30, 1875.

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*, draft of letter from Blake to Mackenzie, Sept. 6, 1874.

<sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*, Mackenzie to Blake, Sept. 18, 1874.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, draft of letter from Blake to Mackenzie, Sept. 24, 1874.

<sup>45</sup>G. M. Hougham, "Canada First: A Minor Party in Microcosm," *C.J.E.P.S.*, XIX (May, 1953), 174-9.

rather young and inexperienced patriots thought here that they had found a leader, but their hopes were shattered when Blake returned to the Cabinet in the spring of 1875.

Meanwhile the speech was highly disturbing to Mackenzie-Brown and company, who could hardly endorse it in the light of the *Globe's* former rejection of the Canada First proposals, and yet could not attack it without aggravating the danger of a rupture between the Grit and Liberal sections of the Ministerialists. It was easy enough for Blake to announce publicly that he would support no further pacification of British Columbia as he did in the Aurora speech. He did not have the responsibility of keeping the Union together.<sup>46</sup>

The negotiations, spurred along by the Liberal politicians who were demanding Blake's re-entry into the Government, were not made easier for Mackenzie by the defeat of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railroad Bill in the Senate in April, 1874. The defeat of his bill, the first practical step undertaken by the Government to carry out the terms of the British Columbia agreement, highlighted the breach within the party when such Liberal M.P.'s as Blake, D. Mills, Thomas Moss and strong Liberal Senators such as E. Y. Penry and William MacMaster voted against it.<sup>47</sup> It seemed more necessary than ever to come to terms with the Blake wing of the party if a British Columbia policy were not to destroy the Liberal party.

In March, Blake had written A. G. Jones, the go-between in this three-cornered contest between Mackenzie, Blake, and those Liberal leaders who were importuning Blake, that

considering the increasing gravity of the situation, the great difficulties which will beset the administration, and the great personal sacrifices involved, I cannot conclude that I am called on to take office unless the Government be constructed on a basis giving the best available guarantees of stability and success. . . . Furthermore I have been opposed to one important part of Mackenzie's policy, and I do not think I ought to be asked to assume personal responsibility for that part of his policy by joining the Government. Had Mackenzie requested it I should in the present critical condition of affairs have consented to join your administration under Holton's lead, Mackenzie retaining the public works or (in case that arrangement were impracticable) to take the lead myself, Mackenzie retaining the public works, and Holton joining the Cabinet; provided an understanding were come to on two or three questions of public policy. . . .<sup>48</sup>

Is it any wonder that Mackenzie regarded these proceedings as a "conspiracy"?<sup>49</sup> There was, no doubt, strong support for the combination of Blake as Prime Minister and Mackenzie as head of Public

<sup>46</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Moss, April 26, 1875.

<sup>47</sup>J. A. Maxwell, "Lord Dufferin and the Difficulties with British Columbia 1874-7," *C.H.R.*, XII (Dec. 1931), 373.

<sup>48</sup>Blake Papers, copy of letter from Blake to Jones, March 19, 1875.

<sup>49</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Brown, March 23, 1875.

Works. However, neither Holton nor Blake wished to put the proposition squarely to Mackenzie.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, Holton could not bring himself to enter the Cabinet, "pleading concern at the dangerous state of his daughter's health."<sup>51</sup>

Holton's decision almost brought an end to the negotiations: "and as your proposal to me and my own action were predicated on the erroneous assumption that Holton had expressed his willingness to you, it seems that the whole negotiation must terminate," Blake wrote Jones.<sup>52</sup> But the interested parties persevered in their efforts. Almost a month later, Edgar thought that "the feeling is evidently improved in the 'cave'" and that the time was favourable "to press" for an answer.<sup>53</sup> Blake continued to prove difficult, however, and Edgar confessed that "he is a perfect enigma to me." Is one of the clues to Blake's attitude to be found in Jones' advice to Mackenzie around this time? "If you will excuse my speaking so frankly to you I think if you consulted him sometimes on important matters that it would be of great value to you both."<sup>54</sup> Was Mackenzie too proud to consult the man who so obviously considered himself better fitted for the leadership and whose hesitations were causing him so much inconvenience and embarrassment?

The pressure on Mackenzie to secure Blake was so strong that he sought an interview with him in which he urged him to act whether or not Holton came in. In subsequent conversations Mackenzie obviously capitulated to Blake's demands regarding the British Columbia question<sup>55</sup> and on May 18 Blake agreed to join the Government on terms that were made public in an Order in Council issued in September. The Cabinet threw over the Esquimalt-Nanaimo railroad as an essentially "local" work and substituted instead a cash bonus of \$750,000. Furthermore, it stated the Government's intention to build the Pacific railroad provided it would not mean an increase in taxation. This was an equivocal position for the Government to take—to promise to build a railroad without increasing the rate of taxation and Blake's shortsighted emphasis on a pay-as-you-go policy played right into Macdonald's hands. As G. A. Walkem, the British Columbia premier, wrote Macdonald in 1878, "A great change has been brought out by Mackenzie's conduct . . . the province with the exception of New West-

<sup>50</sup>Blake Papers, copy of letter from Jones (there is no salutation but the letter is obviously to Mackenzie), April 12, 1875; see also Mackenzie Papers, Jones to Mackenzie, April 12, 1875.

<sup>51</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Jones, April 8, 1875.

<sup>52</sup>Mackenzie Papers, copy of letter, March 24, 1875.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, Edgar to Mackenzie, April 18, 1875.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, Jones to Mackenzie, April (no day), 1875.

<sup>55</sup>Blake Papers, "Copy for confidential perusal" [*sic*], Blake to Mackenzie, April 30, 1875.

minster has become thoroughly Conservative."<sup>56</sup> Moreover, Mackenzie's hold on the party was weakened.<sup>57</sup> If, as the *Ottawa Daily Citizen* suggested, Mackenzie thought he "could use Blake to offset four or five incompetent members in the Cabinet,"<sup>58</sup> he was mistaken as Cabinet changes continued to cause comment in Parliament and in the newspapers.

With the exception of Blake, who was Mackenzie's number one problem, the Ontario contingent remained relatively stable. This was not true of Quebec where a series of troubles continuously unfolded themselves from the time of Dorion's elevation to the Bench to the appointment of Laurier. Dorion's accession as Chief Justice of Quebec in June, 1874 demonstrates at once Mackenzie's generosity toward his friends and his neglect of party interests. Dorion was the only universally accepted leader of the Quebec Liberals,<sup>59</sup> the "very man" in Cartwright's opinion to have given Mackenzie "a strong foothold in Quebec. . . ."<sup>60</sup> And yet, in offering him the office of Chief Justice, Mackenzie told him "to consider solely his own interest," that "he had sacrificed enough for the party already. . . ."<sup>61</sup> He admitted to Holton some time later that the loss of both Blake and Dorion, together with his (Holton's) refusal to join had so weakened the Government that he had seriously considered "throwing up" his commission.<sup>62</sup>

Blake's advice at this juncture gives an insight into some of the political complications with which the Prime Minister was confronted.

In the first place I would advise you not to hurry . . . repeated changes . . . evoke unpleasant feeling. . . . Remember that Macdonald left seats unfilled for months; so no difficulty can arise in the case of precedent.

If you determine to confine yourself to the simple task of replacing Dorion [the former Minister of Justice] the only courses I see are to make Fournier or A. J. Smith Minister of Justice. My opinion is that A. J. Smith is the better man of the two and therefore my [?] of the operation would be to make Smith Minister of Justice and take Geoffrion into the Cabinet. . . .

But . . . this plan leaves your administration very much weaker. . . .

My opinion therefore is that you should try to repair these [?] by adding to your strength in other ways. You have the Collectorship at Halifax and the Dy Superintendency of Indian affairs at [?]. You have two men from Nova Scotia

<sup>56</sup>Quoted by A. D. Lockhart, "The Contribution of Macdonald Conservatism to National Unity, 1854-78," *Canadian Historical Association, Report*, 1939, 131.

<sup>57</sup>Maxwell, "Lord Dufferin and British Columbia," 374.

<sup>58</sup>May 20, 1875.

<sup>59</sup>*Montreal Gazette*, June 1, 1891. Lord Dufferin thought his resignation weakened the ministry "as there was behind Dorion no men to succeed him." Macdonald Papers, 226, Langevin to Macdonald, June 6, 1874.

<sup>60</sup>Cartwright, *Reminiscences*, 142.

<sup>61</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Blake, May 29, 1874.

<sup>62</sup>*Ibid.*, Mackenzie to Holton, Sept. 26, 1876.

who are worse than useless in your Cabinet. I would get rid of both of them and in place of one of them I would put Jones of Halifax who could I think be persuaded to accept office for a reform if it were thought essential in the interests of the party; expecting to be replaced by Vail after the local elections in Nova Scotia; or if Jones will not go in, I would try and get Vail in at once, though his leaving the local government will probably destroy it and throw Nova Scotia into Tupper's hands, which is a very serious matter for us.

As to the other Nova Scotia seat I would not hesitate if I got one very strong man like Jones into a very important office, to use that seat in another Province if thereby I could strengthen the administration by the addition of a man of widespread reputation like Holton.

But I must go further still. I early told you that in my opinion your Cabinet could not long endure if you retained the office of Minister of Public Works. The experience of the past few months has confirmed my opinion. . . .

I would recommend you to consult your colleagues in these matters. . . . You will find it much easier to work the machine. . . . It is not enough in matters of this kind to *be* right; one must be *thought* right too.<sup>63</sup>

Whatever the reason, Mackenzie decided to move Fournier into the Department of Justice and upon the advice of Dorion and Holton, asked Felix Geoffrion, a highly respected and popular M.P. to take Inland Revenue. A few months later (September 30) Vail, enthusiastically endorsed by the *Halifax Citizen*, replaced Ross as the Minister of Militia and Defence.

The Quebec wing of the Cabinet did not long remain settled. Fournier was giving Mackenzie no little trouble. The *Montreal Gazette* criticized him as a man who "dislikes the slavery of Department work and prefers amusing himself to looking after the affairs of state."<sup>64</sup> Mackenzie was undecided as to what to do with him. In November he wrote Jones: "Fournier contrived to get drunk and make a beast of himself in a tavern while his companions fought. What to do I know not, to set him adrift would be to ruin him, to keep him will ruin us. I am consulting Dorion."<sup>65</sup> To replace him would not be a simple matter. He was, in spite of his shortcomings, a very influential man in the district of Quebec and Holton thought that "if he were displaced a host of petty ambitions would instantly spring up to embarrass you."<sup>66</sup>

The inevitable dismissal came in the following October when Fournier was retired "at the request of the Party." Mackenzie was hard pressed to find a substitute. He was of the opinion that there was a strong movement among the French M.P.'s for Joseph Cauchon,<sup>67</sup> a

<sup>63</sup>Blake Papers, draft of letter from Blake to Mackenzie, May 31, 1874.

<sup>64</sup>July 13, 1874.

<sup>65</sup>Mackenzie to Jones, Nov. 27, 1874, in "Letters of Mackenzie to Jones," 46.

<sup>66</sup>Mackenzie Papers, Holton to Mackenzie, Dec. 4, 1874.

<sup>67</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Holton, Oct. 14, 1876; Mackenzie to Joly, Oct. 26, 1875; Mackenzie to Blake, Sept. 25, 1875.

controversial figure whose questionable dealings in public contracts had never been satisfactorily cleared up, and whose long association with the Conservative party (Macdonald had appointed him President of the Senate in 1867) also made him unpalatable to many of the other Liberal leaders.<sup>68</sup> Both Mercier and Joly preferred Wilfrid Laurier, a young lawyer of Arthabaska, as a person likely to attract the younger element of Quebec to the party<sup>69</sup> but other men objected to Mackenzie's passing over the older Liberals.<sup>70</sup> Both Holton and Brown pointed out the advantages and disadvantages. Cauchon was "a very clever man—has more *force* than any other Frenchman now on the field—has long experience to guide him—can think write and speak well and forcibly" but "his record is bad and his temper is bad and his principles are loose, and he is much disliked by a majority of our friends." Laurier was undoubtedly a man who could bring strength but he was as yet untried in a departmental or leadership capacity<sup>71</sup> and Mackenzie lacked the courage to try him. In spite of the obvious risks involved, he accepted Cauchon's explanations of his part in the North Shore Railway dealings, and defended his choice on the grounds that in 1872 he had given up "his Presidency of the Senate and carried Quebec Centre for the opposition. He worked faithfully with us until the change of government . . . and his 'Journal' was the best written paper in lower Canada in our interest."<sup>72</sup> In addition, Cauchon was supposedly on good terms with the clergy and perhaps it was hoped that as an apostate Conservative he would divide the Conservatives of Quebec.

The appointment was very unpopular. The *Nation* wondered that a "high-minded statesman like Mr. Blake" could serve with him. "His accession, to put the case mildly, will not bring much moral strength."<sup>73</sup> Within less than two months Mackenzie was aware of his mistaken judgment but he could not very well oust him so soon. He immediately opened up negotiations with Laurier, however, explaining his predicament and expressing the hope that the latter would accept the invitation shortly to be offered him. He knew that Laurier would not enter the Cabinet while Cauchon was a member of it.<sup>74</sup>

Mackenzie had other troubles with the Quebec wing of the party. Relations between the two leaders of the Quebec minority became

<sup>68</sup>Blake Papers, Edouard Richard to Blake, Sept. 25, 1875.

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*, Mercier to Blake, Sept. 26, 1875; Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Joly, Oct. 26, 1875; Mackenzie Papers, Joly to Mackenzie, Oct. 18, 1875.

<sup>70</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Joly, Oct. 26, 1875.

<sup>71</sup>Mackenzie Papers, Brown to Mackenzie, Nov. 13, 1875; Holton to Mackenzie, Oct. 19, 1875.

<sup>72</sup>Blake Papers, Mackenzie to Blake, Nov. 7, 10, 1875; Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Laurier, Jan. 25, 1876.

<sup>73</sup>Dec. 10, 1875.

<sup>74</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Laurier, Jan. 25, 1876.

strained to the breaking point when Holton, during the debate on the Speech from the Throne, demanded an explanation from Mackenzie of the unfortunate Argenteuil speech made by Huntington during the by-election in late December. This strong attack on the ultramontanism of the Roman Catholic clergy disturbed many Catholic Liberals and Mackenzie could do no more than say that he disapproved of bringing religion into public political discussions.

As Mackenzie tried to keep peace between the two rivals, he was also trying to appease Holton, who was demanding that "the arrangement of last spring" be carried out, and complaining that his influence in matters of party policy was not satisfactory.<sup>75</sup> Mackenzie was faced with a dilemma for Holton's admission to the Cabinet was contingent upon Huntington's retirement, since both represented the same group, and Huntington's arguments in favour of remaining through the session seemed reasonable enough. As Mackenzie reminded Holton, he had considered that his right place was in the Government from the moment he first organized it, and Holton had only himself to blame if he were not yet a member of it.<sup>76</sup> Moreover, he had consulted Holton about every change in the French section of the Cabinet.<sup>77</sup>

One of his great anxieties, at this time, was Geoffrion's illness. He realized that his retirement would "have an ill effect" but he had to have a department head. "Geoffrion's department has been without a head for 15 months," and he felt that he could not "meet Parliament with the Quebec section in the state it is in."<sup>78</sup> Another difficulty was the perennial criticism of Mackenzie's holding the Department of Public Works to the detriment of his leadership.<sup>79</sup> Blake, Holton, Dorion, Jones, and Cartwright—all his colleagues—frequently urged him to give it up.<sup>80</sup> Even the Governor General, Lord Dufferin, pointed out that he was exposing his "health to very grave risks" and that his "Government, as a Government, would be far more successful, if you could relieve yourself of the administrative burden of the public works. . . ."<sup>81</sup> Mackenzie did consider giving it up, but, in the last analysis, for him the problem of finding a substitute was insuperable. To Holton's complaint he replied: "My real trouble has been the results of sectional representation forcing upon me men of so inferior calibre as to be utterly useless as assistants the withdrawal of Dorion and

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, Mackenzie to Holton, Jan. 27, 1876.

<sup>76</sup>*Ibid.*, Jan. 16, 1876; Jan. 27, 1876; Feb. 9, 1876.

<sup>77</sup>*Ibid.*, Sept. 26, 1876.

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.*, Mackenzie to Dorion, Oct. 21, 1876.

<sup>79</sup>*Quebec Morning Chronicle*, May 25, 1874; Cartwright, *Reminiscences*, 123-4.

<sup>80</sup>Blake Papers, draft of letter from Blake to Mackenzie, Oct. 6, 1876; Mackenzie Papers, Holton to Mackenzie, Feb. 21, 1874; Dorion to Mackenzie, June 10, 1874; Jones to Mackenzie, May 25, 1877.

<sup>81</sup>P.A.C., "Selected Private Papers of the First Marquess of Dufferin and Ava, Letters to Mr. A. Mackenzie," Dufferin to Mackenzie, April 14, 1876.

Fournier (at the request of the party) and, pardon me if I repeat it, your refusal to come in at first."<sup>82</sup>

Opinion is unanimous that the Prime Minister lacked executive and administrative help. The *Ottawa Daily Citizen* observed that he had "surrounded himself with a Cabinet of incapables and has more work to do than the man can accomplish."<sup>83</sup> What was he to do? As he said to Holton in the letter quoted above, "I have decided on offering Mills a seat chiefly because he has capacity for work of which I want to avail myself."<sup>84</sup> David Mills was Canada's authority on constitutional law, a highly respected Ontario politician, editor of the *London Advertiser* and an ardent admirer of Edward Blake. With feelings such as they were between the Mackenzie-Brown and Blake wings of the Liberal party this step seemed calculated to strengthen Blake rather than Mackenzie.<sup>85</sup> Mackenzie saw the implications but he was desperate for help. To Holton he defended the choice on the ground that while this appointment might "affect myself prejudicially some day . . . these troublesome people are safer in harness than cantering along beside your carriage kicking up their heels and frightening the team."<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, Blake, ever his sensitive self, had sent in his resignation on September 25 over an alleged difference of opinion between himself and his colleagues on the question of commutations of capital sentences<sup>87</sup> and though he had been prevailed upon to remain Mackenzie was desirous that "Mr. Blake should have in one colleague one who could be called a constant friend to himself."<sup>88</sup>

Unhappily, not everybody was satisfied. Mills' entrance had been at the price of Laird's resignation and though Laird was appointed the northwest Governor, the Islanders complained.<sup>89</sup> In vain did Mackenzie explain that he had to have legal assistance in the Government and that it was not unreasonable for Ontario with 1,500,000 population and great tax-paying powers to have five members in the Cabinet, while the Maritimes with three-quarters of a million population were represented by four.<sup>90</sup> He argued also that it was "impossible to lay down

<sup>82</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Holton, Oct. 14, 1876.

<sup>83</sup>July 9, 1874; Ross, *Getting into Parliament*, 101-2.

<sup>84</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Holton, Oct. 14, 1876.

<sup>85</sup>*Ottawa Daily Citizen*, Oct. 13, 1876. "The appointment of Mills has given increased importance to Mr. Blake. . . ."

<sup>86</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Holton, Oct. 14, 1876.

<sup>87</sup>Blake Papers, draft of letter from Blake to Mackenzie, Sept. 25, 1876.

<sup>88</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to John Cameron, Oct. 27, 1876.

<sup>89</sup>In accepting the Cabinet seat, Mills wrote to Mackenzie, "I don't know how far our friends may be disposed to insist upon the system of provincial representation in the Government. The system is a vicious one, and if it can be got rid of it will be a real gain to the country." Mackenzie Papers, Mills to Mackenzie, Oct. 10, 1876.

<sup>90</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to L. H. Davies, Oct. 25, 1876. Mackenzie had had a letter from L. H. Davies, the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia explaining how this appointment would affect the local political situation. It is a good example of how

a rule that all the provinces shall be represented in the Cabinet," that the Prime Minister must have liberty of choice. Nevertheless, Prince Edward Island remained dissatisfied as long as she was without a seat.

*L'Événement*, a Liberal Montreal paper, took the rumors of Mr. Geoffrion's withdrawal from the Government as the opportunity to suggest that this was an opportune moment for the Liberal Government to begin reorganizing for the elections of 1878, and warned that while the Conservative party was not by any means perfect, it was "animated by a great energy and a lively amount of enthusiasm."<sup>91</sup> After a period of inactivity in debate, Macdonald had once again resumed his former fighting role of attacking the Liberals at their weakest points—the depression, or their failure to surmount it, their Pacific railroad policy, their "Little Canadianism." Taking the initiative in the summer of 1876 with the inauguration of a series of picnics, the Conservatives presented alternatives to the Liberal policies in a strong attachment to the British connection, the building of the Pacific railroad, and protection for Canadian industry.

For all his labours, Mackenzie could not reduce the confusion of Quebec politics to order. Dorion's elevation to the Bench and Geoffrion's illness had left Quebec without a recognized leader. No one could bring about harmony amid the differences. Then Blake served notice again. He was sick and informed Mackenzie that he could no longer remain a minister. Mackenzie himself was ill. Cabinet changes, so often the subject of criticism—justifiably so in terms of administrative efficiency—continued to take place. On June 12, 1877, the *Ottawa Daily Citizen* reported that "the last Ministerial Shuffle has taken the country by surprise." This was in reference to Laflamme's appointment to the Department of Justice, Blake's to the Presidency of the Council, and Cauchon's to the Department of Inland Revenue. Rudolphe Laflamme, formerly one of the chief editors of *L'Avenir*, had been admitted to the Cabinet in the preceding November, much to the consternation of Holton and Isidore Thibaudeau, the representative

---

federal politics react on local. Laird's appointment would necessitate a new by-election to fill his vacated place in Parliament; therefore, it was unwelcome. "We have had so many elections on the Island the last few years that many of our friends have become tired and apathetic. The late Local elections which were fought out fiercely, on what we call the Free non sectarian school ticket precipitated to a considerable extent the amalgamation of portions of the old Liberal and Conservative parties. The Roman Catholic Liberals all joined the conservative wing led by J. C. Pope and a great many of the old Conservatives led by T. H. Haviland joined hands with us. The new Govt of which I am the leader consists of representative men from both the old camps and as we have only been a month or so in office you will at once understand how anxious I was to avoid a Dominion election which might result in driving our new friends into their old ranks." Mackenzie Papers, L. H. Davies to Mackenzie, Oct. 13, 1876.

<sup>91</sup>Quebec *Morning Chronicle*, Oct. 26, 1876.

from Quebec East.<sup>92</sup> Blake, under the usual importunities of his friends and of Mackenzie who did not see how the Government could continue without him, had agreed to stay on in an office that did not require much work. Mackenzie and the party would have preferred to have Laurier enter the Cabinet immediately but Cauchon's retirement at the moment was not expedient as he was in the midst of preparing a report for Mgr. Conroy, the Papal Legate.

Bishop Conroy of Ardagh, Ireland, was Rome's answer to the appeal made by Joseph Cauchon on behalf of the Liberals for a judgment on the ultramontane charges brought against them. Rome had been listening to rival charges of the ultramontanes and the Catholic Liberals for some time now and had decided to send a representative to investigate thoroughly the whole political situation in Quebec with a view to settling authoritatively once and for all the position which the Church in Quebec should take toward the Canadian political parties. In June, when these changes were made, the affair seemed to be progressing nicely for the Liberals, and Mackenzie made this amusing observation: "Lafamme has suddenly become very pious. Pelletier, [Charles Alphonse Pelletier a founder of *le parti national*, had been appointed to the Cabinet in January] declares he never could endure Red Republicanism. Huntington is to attend the confessional and recant his Argenteuil speech or declare he never made it . . . Cauchon is radiant. He believes he brought this dignitary to Canada and that a regeneration of Church and State must follow his pious efforts. Scott thinks we are all Catholics and he is so happy I don't like to contradict him."<sup>93</sup>

The decision reached by the Papal Legate was published in a joint pastoral on October 11. It made the distinction between Catholic liberalism and political liberalism which Laurier had made in the speech before the Club Canadien which had brought him into national prominence in the preceding June. The censures made against Catholic liberalism were not to be applied to political liberalism, to any particular political party.

But the ultramontanes were "more Catholic than the Pope" and twenty years passed before religious peace reigned in Quebec. Laurier was a victim of the religious struggle in the re-election which his long-

<sup>92</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Thibaudeau, Dec. 14, 1876; Blake Papers, Mackenzie to Blake, May 30, 1877.

<sup>93</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Letellier, June 7, 1877. Pelletier's appointment is a good example of a pre-Confederation precedent which was carried over into the Confederation cabinet. It was always necessary to have both Quebec City and Montreal represented in the French section of the cabinet. As Mackenzie explained to Brown: "by Quebec Province usage I had to take a man from that District." Again, Laurier, had to await his turn because while he "would do well very well . . . the Counties below Quebec would have neither Senator or Minister and I found serious trouble on that account." Mackenzie Papers, Mackenzie to Brown, Jan. 19, 1877.

awaited appointment to the Cabinet necessitated. He was defeated in Drummond-Arthabaska partly by the old ultramontane arguments used by his opponents but also due to "overconfidence in his own popularity."<sup>94</sup> After the defeat a seat in Quebec East was opened for him and this time a better organized campaign counteracted the Conservative effort.

The Cabinet sustained one last blow in the second resignation of Edward Blake in January, 1878 and the accession of A. G. Jones, the Nova Scotian leader, did not redress the balance. Blake's most recent attempt to depart from the Cabinet had gotten under way in the previous October. He simply could not reconcile his conscience to staying in the Government without working and his doctors had warned him that any worry and stress would be fatal.<sup>95</sup> Mackenzie and the Liberal leaders did all they could to dissuade him but Blake found it impossible to change his conclusion. Reluctantly, but satisfied that "there is nothing of either personal or political estrangement," Mackenzie at last accepted Blake's resignation on January 18.<sup>96</sup> Blake's name had been the strongest in the Cabinet roster and his resignation cast by implication an unfavourable light on the administration. Honoré Mercier wrote him, "I believe honestly you have given a decisive blow and brought with you our last hope. Laurier and you could have saved the party. Laurier alone will be powerless."<sup>97</sup>

And so he was. The Mackenzie administration limped along during its last session in office in the winter of 1878. The efficiency which Jones brought to the Militia and Laurier to Inland Revenue, and the continued good work of Huntington and Mills, could not counteract the "economical" railroad policy of the Government which continued to alienate British Columbia, or the "free trade" policy of Cartwright which displeased businessmen. Both policies gave the Conservatives grounds for sharp and telling attacks. But it was not merely the Conservatives "but the shocking incapacity of my Atty Genl which troubled me more." And if Mackenzie's statement regarding the performance of most of his Cabinet ministers in the House and their uselessness in preparing "House work" can be accepted, then his life, as he confessed to his brother, had surely been "miserable" during the session. He had written in May:

It was impossible for me to prepare for House work and I had no one to trust it to. Cartwright was master of his own department but nothing else. Mills needed curbing all the time, although able and efficient. Laurier was sick all through.

<sup>94</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Blake, Nov. 9, 1877. University of Western Ontario, David Mills Letterbook, July 7 to Feb. 13, 1878, D. M. to Patterson, Oct. 31, 1877.

<sup>95</sup>Blake Papers, Blake to Mackenzie, Oct. 6, 1877.

<sup>96</sup>Mackenzie Letterbook, Mackenzie to Blake, Jan. 18, 1877.

<sup>97</sup>Blake Papers, Mercier to Blake, Feb. 5, 1878.

Jones master of his own office completely but without knowledge of general work. Laflamme well nothing could be worse. Huntington behind with his own though always willing. Smith too fat and easy only a good counsellor. Burpee a model office man but not good for six sentences in the House and no parliamentary knowledge. I assure you my life was miserable.

And yet, after this indictment of his ministers' performance, he optimistically adds, "For all that I felt all through that the session was successful for us and I am sure Macdonald is too good a judge not to feel the same."<sup>98</sup>

Mackenzie attributed his defeat in the general elections of 1878 mainly to the "depression and the belief instilled into the poorer classes" that the Government had been indifferent to their plight. Further, "the protective theory had taken a deeper hold of the popular mind than we had supposed." But a more important factor in his defeat was his complete lack of political instinct. Mackenzie was not a politician in any sense of the term. Moreover, he failed to see the connection between a strong party organization and a strong government. So determined was he to give Canada an honest administration—one superior in every respect to the preceding "scandalous" one—that he neglected one of the primary means of attaining it, a party strong enough to keep his Government in power. This sincere desire to serve on the one hand, and his righteous pride on the other, led him to hold on to the Department of Public Works in spite of compelling advice against it. He thus compromised his position as party leader and policy-maker. Cartwright's indictment is strong. Combining the two offices was in his opinion "a fatal error . . . it was the fault of the administration. . . . Nothing could compensate to his party for his neglect of his duty as leader."<sup>99</sup> His inability to be ruthless for the good of the party lost him Quebec and Nova Scotia; his inept handling of Blake weakened his hold on Ontario. Errors in judgment complicated his problems. Insecure and not particularly attractive as a personality, he failed to inspire confidence and loyalty. In short, as a party leader Alexander Mackenzie was no match for John A. Macdonald—this was the verdict of the Canadian people in the general elections of 1878.

<sup>98</sup>Mackenzie Papers, Mackenzie to Charles, May 12, 1878. Mackenzie's opinion of most of his ministers was not flattering. He had written to Charles in 1877: "Of course the heavy work is to come and I find I must rely chiefly on myself. Mr. B. won't take a hand in unless everything is as clear as day. So much is this the case that I sometimes think he would not be sorry to see me worsted Huntington is willing but he is not industrious in fitting himself up and he is imprudent. Smith is lazy Burpee knows his own business nothing more. Vail I cannot let loose Coffin has neither talent tongue or sense Mills and Cartwright are always willing and effective Cauchon no use. Scott is not always near me and he often blunders in the Senate in spite of all my posting of him daily. You will see I have [?] troubles still I don't lose heart very often." *Ibid.*, March 4, 1877.

<sup>99</sup>Cartwright, *Reminiscences*, 123-4.

### History Paperbacks in 1959

#### Ancient and Mediaeval

IT IS PROBABLY indicative of a basic historical prejudice going back, ultimately, to the humanists of the early Renaissance and never seriously reconsidered until the present day, that the great majority of paperbacks offered in the field of ancient history are concerned primarily with literature, while those in the mediaeval period deal almost exclusively with religion. Subconsciously, however much we may officially know better, we still feel that literature happened in antiquity and religion happened in the Middle Ages.

The exception proves the rule; religion also happened in Egypt. J. H. Breasted's classic *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (Harper Torchbooks; Musson) has held its position for half a century. The reissue is to be commended, although it may perhaps be feared that the common reader, enticed by Egypt's reputation for mystic science or avid to be told about pyramid inches, will find such a mass of scholarship hard to digest. Still, there are today a fair number of respectable popular introductions to archaeology in the pocket-book format and price range, and the contribution of something more solid for those whose appetites are whetted is timely and need not lack appreciative readers.

Another ancient civilization, too long neglected, has received tardy justice from A. T. Olmstead in his *History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago Phoenix; University of Toronto). We are much too apt to regard Persia as a mere periphery, both to ancient history and to the Old Testament. Professor Olmstead, essentially for the first time, treated it as an important culture in its own right. This is both desirable from the point of view of historical method and also useful in overcoming the vague anti-Persian bias which is the inevitable result of looking at Persia from Marathon and Thermopylae, or from the Waters of Babylon. Our own civilization owes more than it knows to the Medes and Persians and their satellites—from money to the idea of the Devil. With such a vast task before him, the author necessarily ranged at large over what would normally be several fields of study, and although one is never left in doubt of his command of the material the result on the whole lacks unity. This probably could not have been avoided, but it is doubly unfortunate that the author did not live to give his work the final polish.

Returning to more familiar parts of the ancient world, the humanist conception takes relentless hold. The very title of *The Spring of Civilization: Periclean Athens* (Dutton Everyman; Dent) admits of no compromise. This is a collection of classic translations from classical authors edited by C. A. Robinson, Jr., with a fine photographic section on fifth-century art. It should, I suppose, be left to classical scholars to judge such a compilation, but historians will feel that history

has been hard done by. The dramatists, and Plato, are allowed to say their say without interruptions, but Thucydides and Xenophon get short passages embedded in editorial comment and summary—and heaven knows they are no more long-winded than Plato. Moreover, if only two historians are to be chosen to represent Greece, reason requires that one of them should be Herodotus. The *Roman Reader* (Macmillan Viking) is in principle a very similar collection—an anthology of translations as well as originals—but is much more satisfactory. The editor, Basil Davenport has ranged farther, both in time—he covers the whole course of Roman letters from Plautus to the fall of the Western Empire—and in literary types; and whereas Robinson drew only upon absolutely standard and familiar texts, he supplies the reader with a great deal of little-known matter that he would be unlikely to discover for himself. Lucretius, Lucan, a good deal of Catullus, the whole of the *Pervigilium Veneris*—these are commonly ignored in schools and not easy to find in translation, and a thorough-going distortion in one's attitude towards the Romans and their culture may easily result. The general effect of a catholic selection such as this is to make the Romans altogether more credible as human beings than the marble statues of one's usual mental picture. With *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, by Tenney Frank (University of California), history as ordinarily understood takes a more prominent place. The author's aim was to determine how far the founders of Latin literature, before the Augustan age, were directly influenced by their social and historical environment. By implication this involves a close and severe re-examination of all supposed foreign influences, especially the Greek. Actually it could be maintained that Frank discounted Greek influence too far, although this is undoubtedly a fault on the right side in the present state of the question, and it is strange that he gave no credit even to the possibility of Etruscan influence. It is true that we know nothing about Etruscan literature (except magical and ceremonial texts which are not to the purpose), so any conjecture based on it would have to remain merely conjecture, but after all the Romans did acquire their alphabet from Etruria; they neither borrowed it from Greece nor invented it for themselves. Be that as it may, the book is eminently readable and deals in a stimulating way with a period of literary and intellectual history not always, perhaps, rated at its true worth in comparison with the Augustan age which followed.

All these last three, in one way or another, breathe a faint, elusive scent of first year college courses in World Culture or Classics in translation. There is blessedly no such suggestion to be found in M. I. Finley's *The World of Odysseus* (Longmans Meridian). The title would lead one to expect that the author had attempted the foredoomed task of making sense of Homer's geography. The task he actually set himself, to use Homer as a historical source, would seem just as hopeless if it had not been accomplished. Finley ransacked the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* for passages which unwittingly revealed social attitudes, and constructed a brilliant and fascinating picture of a Greece utterly unlike the schoolboy's vision of Periclean Athens—a world in which Athens hardly existed, where warrior chiefs conducted their lives on principles closer to those of the Haida or Kwakiutl Indians than to those of Socrates. Indeed, as he describes it, this is very much the world of the totem pole and the *potlatch*—a book to be most warmly recommended.

Before leaving the classics, it is convenient here to notice the Penguin edition of Josephus' *The Jewish War* (Pelican). G. A. Williamson, the editor and translator, has achieved an unusual feat: he has produced a readable and sensitive rendering of an author whom he obviously detests with a deep personal loathing. We needed a clear and accessible translation, and Williamson has done a great deal to help the

reader by sorting out the undivided text into chapters, notes, and appendixes, and by supplying such notes and appendixes of his own as the matter requires. These include the suspect passages found only in the "slavonic" version. Josephus has acquired a new interest for twentieth-century readers through the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. One of the latest offerings on this subject in paperback is Edmund Wilson's *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (Longmans Meridian). This account has considerable merit, especially in the quantity of background information it manages to supply, and in comparison with some other works on this subject the author's views on the religious implications of the discovery are sane and temperate—more so than one would have expected from a man of such decided opinions. The book has, however, a radical defect in its form. Taken mostly from articles Wilson wrote for the *New Yorker* while work on the Qumran site was still in progress, it bears the stamp of journalism with all the concomitant vices of "human interest touches" and writing for effect; and it is out of date. For instance, the copper scrolls had not been unravelled when Wilson first wrote, and in revising for this edition he contented himself with a footnote to the effect that the problem was now solved. Considering that Allegro's later account, for one, has been in paperback for years, this is scarcely good enough. This kind of reprinting would only be appropriate in a "Collected Works of Edmund Wilson." Still, we perhaps ought to welcome all the books on the scrolls that we can get, as at least promoting discussion, until the implications of the discoveries have been fully worked out and integrated into the various branches of study—archaeological, historical, and biblical—which are affected by them. Biblical scholars in the tradition of the old "higher criticism" are no doubt the most to be pitied, for more often than other scholars they have committed themselves to assumptions which the scrolls have exploded; it is like the discovery of a *genuine* Piltown skull.

The work of a distinguished representative of this school, Johannes Weiss, is now available in paperback: *Earliest Christianity*, a two-volume history of the period A.D. 30–150 (Harper Torchbooks; Musson). This was the culminating work of its author's career as a Bible critic (it was not quite finished when he died in 1914), and has a maturity and breadth of outlook which such studies, in that age, tended to lack. On the whole, it is remarkable how well he can stand up to the unfair test of later knowledge. (The chief point where the scrolls could make difficulties is in the treatment of St. John's Gospel—the part of the book completed after Weiss's death by Rudolph Knopf.) Weiss had the merit—it is hard, looking back, to realize how revolutionary this was in his day—of understanding that he was dealing with a religion, not a social or political movement; a religion which grew up against a Jewish, not a pagan background; and one in which its early leaders sincerely believed. We can scarcely claim that these lessons have been universally learned today, but at least today the other opinions have been driven into the underworld of historical fiction, where such as Robert Graves have their being.

The story begun by Weiss has been carried down to modern times, in different ways, by Martin E. Marty in *A Short History of Christianity* (Longmans Meridian) and Archbishop Alban Goodier in *Saints for Sinners* (Doubleday Image). Both should perhaps be described as works of edification rather than history proper. Marty's (an original in the paperback edition) is edification for Protestants, firmly liberal in tone and oecumenical in tendency, while Archbishop Goodier's is edification for Catholics, illustrating the dedicated life through the biographies of several widely contrasted saints, simply told. A similar task has been undertaken in a more secular spirit for the Jews by Paul Goodman in his

*History of the Jews* (Dutton Everyman; Dent). It is not really feasible to attempt a history covering Jewry in all its aspects, and Goodman sensibly concentrated on one: after a very slight treatment of the origins, his main theme is the struggle for emancipation after the final loss of national independence. His own death nearly coincided with the establishment of the state of Israel and the story has been carried to that point, and wisely no further, by Israel Cohen. The work is to be praised for covering no more than it conveniently can, and covering it in a manner as nearly free from passion and prejudice as a subject of this kind will allow.

A preoccupation with religion is naturally still present in Christopher Dawson's *Mediaeval Essays* (Doubleday Image); indeed, this collection was mainly founded on his *Mediaeval Religion*, and from so distinguished a Catholic scholar one would expect nothing else. General social and cultural questions, however, were within his purview, and the essay in this volume on "The Moslem West and the Oriental Background of Later Mediaeval Culture," for example, is scarcely monkish or superstitious in inspiration. But Dawson's reputation needs no assistance from me.

A mind equally far-ranging is presented to us in epitome in *Men and Ideas* (Longmans Meridian), a selection from the shorter works of Johan Huizinga. The essays included vary in scope and intensity from "The Task of Cultural History" to "John of Salisbury: A Pre-Gothic Mind," and reveal Huizinga's genius in all its moods. Many will find especially welcome the two essays which discuss the nature of the Renaissance, as the difficulties inherent in the concept "Renaissance" have become widely known owing to the popularity as a paperback of Huizinga's own *Waning of the Middle Ages*.

I need do no more than notice in passing a reissue of Henry Adams' *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* (Doubleday Anchor). This happens to coincide with another attempt to relate a personal view of the Middle Ages to a description of its architectural monuments—Allan Temko's *Notre Dame of Paris: The Biography of a Cathedral* (Macmillan Viking). The title fitly expresses Temko's intention, which was in fact to anthropomorphize the great church (frequently more or less identified with its patron saint) and then take it as a representative character of the age that saw its building. Such a conception may appear unbearably affected, and it must be admitted that the style is too luxurious for the taste of the average academic, but it is one way of making the past live, and Temko besides being very thoroughly grounded in his subject, has the virtues as well as the brashness of a picturesque historical imagination. He is not likely to challenge Henry Adams' rank as a classic, but he sticks to the point better. His publisher has done him proud in the matter of illustrations, which must always be a matter of anxiety in a cheap edition.

Religion had its last field-day as a focus of historical interest at the Reformation, after which of course we became political and modern. What exactly was the result, outside religion proper, of that cataclysm has been a perennial source of acrimonious dispute. One notable contribution to the fray which has now been issued is Karl Holl's *The Cultural Significance of the Reformation* (Longmans Meridian). The title is perhaps not the author's own choice, but in any case it is misleading: the book is essentially an apologia, a contribution to the Protestant side in the controversy. Since it has to rely mainly on personal interpretations rather than hard facts, its obvious tendentiousness seriously weakens its argument although it does not necessarily destroy its value; the author's bias is too obvious and avowed to mislead. On the credit side Holl could boast of enormous and wide-

ranging knowledge. In particular it is remarkable that a continental historian (and one completing his work during the First World War) should show such familiarity and sympathy with the English Puritan tradition.

The Reformation did not suddenly kill superstition; some superstitions flourished after it as never before. Puritans were responsible for some of the worst witch trials. In view of the paucity of fair-minded works on this topic, we must welcome the new issue of Charles Williams' *Witchcraft* (Longmans Meridian). It is to be supposed, from his novels, that Williams actually believed in witchcraft, and to many minds that destroys the value of anything he may have to say on the subject. Yet it is conceivably better that the subject should sometimes be treated by a writer of moderate mind not wholly out of sympathy with the delusions he has to describe, rather than that the question should be left to the fanatics and the sceptics. In this we may be content to say (trusting not to offend pious ears) that the history of witchcraft only raises in an acuter form a problem of personal bias which is inseparable from the history of religion.

ELLIOT ROSE

The University of Toronto

### Modern

DESPITE A STRIKING variety in quality and utility, paperback reprints and originals on modern European history more than continued to justify their existence in 1959. Source collections, pedagogy, philosophy of history, narrow monographs, and broader studies which have become recognized as classics all received attention in these inexpensive editions. Most welcome was the appearance of historical documents, particularly a new selection of the works of Marx and Engels. Lewis S. Feuer's *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy* (Doubleday Anchor) includes works and selections on the philosophy of history and "political sociology" which provide an excellent introduction to the proponents of scientific socialism. While the editor's interests have led to an omission of economic analyses, the historian may forgive if not welcome this exclusion, for the result is the inclusion of large excerpts from historical works, including *The Class Struggles in France: 1848-1850*; *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*; *The Civil War in France*; and *The Peasant War in Germany*, as well as the complete *Manifesto*. The curious Introduction is an apology for the edition, urging the United States public to read the documents because of Marxism's influence on Western thought, and its continuing relevance for contemporary society.

At the opposite pole of history is the extremely useful reprint of Elizabeth G. Holt's *A Documentary History of Art, II, Michelangelo and the Mannerists: The Baroque and the Eighteenth Century* (Doubleday Anchor). Those who have already seen the first volume in paperback form will readily peruse the second. The writings of representative painters, sculptors, and architects from most European countries have been chosen to show the life of the artist, his ideas on art, and his relations with his social environment including his patrons.

For the Renaissance scholar, Charles S. Singleton's new translation of Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier* (Doubleday Anchor), will be welcomed because of its closer adherence to the original manuscript than recent English editions. The complete, unexpurgated Castiglione is presented with brief explanatory notes and contemporaneous illustrations. In sharp contrast is George T. Matthews' new selection of Fugger newsletters, *News and Rumor in Renaissance Europe* (Putnam's Capricorn; Longmans). While its title may be eye-catching for the general

reader, it is of little use to anyone interested in serious history. A series of unconnected reports of Fugger agents on both significant and trivial events in Europe from 1568 to 1604 have been thrown together in chronological order. The Introduction, which might have tied the letters together or at least provided a short introduction to the Fuggers, is not worth consulting.

Two paperbacks cover general historical problems. Carl G. Gustavson's *Preface to History* (McGraw-Hill) was probably destined to enter the paperback field since it probes a question which has perplexed every teacher of history: how to make students think historically. The volume introduces the student to problems such as seeing the past in the present, understanding the underlying causes of change, and separating the various factors in history. The result is a very readable discussion of historical method which at times transcends superficial history, at others set it in too rigid a mould. For the student who is overwhelmed by data, the book will prove useful. However, the keener student will probably be more enlightened by a year's study of the stuff of history. More inspiring for student and teacher is Philip Lee Ralph's *The Story of Our Civilization: 10,000 Years of Western Man* (Dutton Everyman; Dent). Already hailed by distinguished historians, it is a challenging interpretation of the causes of the rise and fall of civilizations and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of Western society.

The reappearance of three classics on the early modern period of European history was one of the high points of paperback publication in the past year. One must admit that G. P. Gooch's *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century* (Harper Torchbooks; Musson) is outdated. Still it serves a purpose by pulling together the gamut of radical thought in seventeenth-century England. Carl Becker's *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers* (Yale; Burns and MacEachern) is well known, and continues to be thought provoking regardless of one's personal criticism of his thesis. A ghost of a bygone age of historiography, but instructive as a commentary on the author and his times is Lord Acton's *Lectures on the French Revolution* (Noonday; Montreal: Book Centre). In addition, Acton's insight on the Revolution is still instructive for the present generation of historians.

Other reprints on the early modern period are less useful, mainly due to the narrowness of the subjects. Aldous Huxley's *Grey Eminence: A Biographical Account of Religion and Politics in Cardinal Richelieu's France* (Longmans Meridian) makes the mysticism in early seventeenth-century Catholicism come to life, and explains the entry of the mystic, Father Joseph, into the field of power politics. However, the account of the political background is rather conventional, and at times Huxley sheds more light on his own ideas than on the life of his subject. The historian will raise his eyebrows when he reads the conclusion which asserts that Richelieu's right-hand man caused most of the evils of modern history by his misdirected political activities. Huxley's *The Devils of Loudon: A Study in the Psychology of Power Politics and Mystical Religion in the France of Cardinal Richelieu* (Harper Torchbooks; Musson) is a more balanced account, albeit of a more unbalanced topic. Using recent psychological analysis, he probes the motivation behind the possession of the Sisters at Loudon by "devils." In so doing he paints a realistic picture of some aspects of seventeenth-century society which make the twentieth-century man grateful to have escaped such an existence.

Cecil Roth's *A History of the Marranos* (Longmans Meridian) is a broader religious study. Despite the author's admission that recent research has not been incorporated in the reprint, it is a scholarly and dispassionate account of the per-

secution of relapsed Jewry in Spain after 1391 which can still be read with profit. Less useful is William Lytle Schurtz's *The Manila Galleon* (Dutton Everyman; Dent), an exhaustive study of the rise and fall of the fortunes of the Spanish trade route from the Philippines to the New World, and its connection with Asiatic and other European powers in the Pacific.

Two biographical studies discuss the main intellectual currents in the nineteenth century. Isaiah Berlin's *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment* (Oxford Galaxy) successfully combines biography and broader history. In a slim volume Berlin cleverly connects Marx's life with his Hegelian background, and shows the evolution of his thought and his role in the socialist circles of his day. As a critique of Marx, the book is less useful, although the critical Bibliography guides the student through the ever increasing maze of Marxist exegesis. The success of Berlin's work is clearly demonstrated when one turns to William Irvine's *Apes, Angels and Victorians: Darwin, Huxley and Evolution* (Longmans Meridian). Irvine has attempted to give a definitive account of the lives of Darwin and Huxley along with a full study of the development of evolutionary theory to the death of the two men. Unfortunately the task is insuperable, and the organization has obscured the salient characteristics of Darwinism by subordinating them to a rigid chronological study of Darwin's life and publications. Irvine's admirable style has occasionally led him to gloss over important problems with glib phraseology.

A third book on the nineteenth century, published for the first time, indicates the high level of the French series on universal knowledge, *Que Sais-Je* (868 inexpensive volumes have appeared to date). Pierre Miquel's *L'Affaire Dreyfus* (Presses Universitaires de France) is an able summary of the Dreyfus Case in 126 pages. The various theories of guilt—Esterhazy and Henry, rightists in the General Staff, widespread treasonous elements in the army—are examined carefully in the context of the development of the Affair. However, Miquel avoids a judgment, pending further investigation. The author's conclusions on the effects of the Dreyfus Case for the elements embroiled in the controversy are judicious. Of greatest interest is the thesis that the Affair brought the Republic for the first time under the influence of broad public opinion despite the attempt of republicans and rightists to keep the case out of public discussion.

Twentieth-century studies are focussed on the history of Communist Russia. It is with extreme gratitude that one sees the appearance in an inexpensive edition of Georg von Rauch's *A History of Soviet Russia* (Praeger; Burns and MacEachern). As the best one-volume account of the subject it will undoubtedly have a wide sale. Rauch has avoided writing an analysis of Soviet Russia from Marxist or anti-Marxist ideological viewpoints. Rather, this is a solid, balanced, chronological introduction to the history of Soviet Russia from the roots of the Revolution to post-1945 developments. In Leon Trotsky's *The Russian Revolution* (Doubleday Anchor) F. W. Dupee has succeeded in providing a satisfactory new abridgment of Trotsky's class study of the Revolution. He has wisely refrained from mutilating the text. Instead, the first and third volumes on the two revolutions of 1917 have been preserved except for summaries of a few chapters, and the second volume on the intervening period has been reduced to a short summation. While a complete paperback Trotsky would have been preferable, the editor has given enough of the revolutionary figure's work to show his keen appraisal of the Revolution from a Marxian viewpoint. Milovan Djilas' *The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System* (Praeger; Burns and MacEachern) does not rank with

Trotsky, but is an intriguing attempt by a disillusioned Marxist to show the inevitability of the rise of a ruling class in the "classless" Soviet society.

Two volumes on India fit very neatly together. Nehru's *Discovery of India* (Doubleday Anchor), edited by Robert I. Crane, is too well known to need further comment: it is as attractive in paper as it was in the original. D. Mackenzie Brown's *The White Umbrella: Indian Political Thought from Manu to Gandhi* (University of California), however, is in some ways more valuable. The author has selected eight representative thinkers who, taken together, reveal the main phases of Indian political thought, as well as its essential coherence. Lengthy extracts from the works of those selected form the core of the work. Professor Brown has contented himself with an able Introduction on "the nature of Indian thought" and a brief essay on the authors selected. The publication of these two books, in addition to the Beacon edition last year of Nehru's autobiography, provide a good beginning for an inexpensive undergraduate library in Indian history, and it is hoped that more will follow.

As a postscript on history paperbacks in 1959 mention should be made of four books verging on history. Mircea Eliade's *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return* (Harper Torchbooks; Musson) approaches the field of philosophy of history, while Etienne Gilson's *God and Philosophy* (Yale; Burns and MacEachern) is concerned with the history of philosophy. Eliade examines the attitude of pre-Christian societies to history, showing their belief that events were important only when viewed as recreations of mythical acts at the beginning of the world. His analysis of the Christian tendency to see, for the first time, a linear progressive history is followed by a brief and unsubstantiated suggestion that Western thought is now returning to a non-historical view. Gilson examines the notions of important Western thinkers about the nature of God, and then supports the existence of the Christian God as most satisfactory philosophically.

Two Pelican books introduce the reader to art history. Kenneth Clark's *Leonardo da Vinci: An Account of His Development as an Artist* is an exciting examination of Leonardo's art woven around the thesis of the artist's struggle between the ideals of aestheticism and scientific truth. The introductory commentary to this reprint is interesting for its revelation of the changes in Clark's interpretation since the original publication. Of equal interest is J. M. Richards' *An Introduction to Modern Architecture* which makes contemporary architecture meaningful for its admirers and detractors alike. The return of architects to basic architectural problems after the eclecticism of the nineteenth century, and the influence of changes in machinery and building materials in the evolution of contemporary building are stressed. Historians might wish for substantiation of the statement that modern architecture's "straightforwardness and repose and logic" is in tune with "this highly mechanized scientific age," but considered as an introduction to his subject, Richards' study must be considered an outstanding achievement.

It is encouraging to discover that in the past year the needs of the teacher and student were not completely subordinated to the material interests of the paperback publisher and the tastes of the mass public. The danger was evident occasionally in the appearance of narrow monographs or broader studies more commendable for their general interest than their utility for the historically minded. But the occasional tendency in this direction was more than balanced by the publication of many useful histories, some of outstanding quality, and several which will prove indispensable for the historian's craft.

A. LLOYD MOOTE

The University of Toronto

## American

THE "Chicago History of American Civilization" series (University of Chicago; University of Toronto), edited by Daniel J. Boorstin, has so far achieved a considerable success. The editor announced, in his first prefatory remarks, that his series of over twenty titles contains two general classes: a "chronological" group to provide a general narrative of American history, and a "topical" group to deal with "varied and important aspects of American life." All of the Chicago series titles under consideration in this review, except *The War for Independence*, fall into the chronological class.

While the purposes of the series are thus somewhat clarified, it is my impression that much of the success of these books can be attributed to the wisdom of authors and editor in neither following nor insisting upon a rigidly chronological approach. In fact, the volumes that attempt to be essays (or groups of essays) rather than general narratives are much the best. Perhaps there is a worthwhile lesson in this for other publishers in the field: a series of paperbacks will only be disjointed components of yet another two-volume survey of American history unless they approach the periods of that history with an eye to more than narrative. The real secret seems to lie in the idea of keeping students, and that part of the public which can still read, abreast of new research and the conflict of interpretations. This purpose can only be fulfilled if the editor selects authors who have done serious research in their designated periods, and Professor Boorstin has based his choice to a large extent on this criterion. The result has been the production not of fundamentally new interpretations but of some very skilful discussions of old and recent interpretations frequently enlivened by fresh insights into minor aspects of those interpretations. A most attractive feature of this series, also, is the critical Bibliography at the end of each volume.

Edmund S. Morgan's *The Birth of the Republic, 1763-89* reviews the events of the period as well as the clashing interpretations of the colonial debate on the empire, the Revolution, and the constitution. As in his earlier work on *The Stamp Act Crisis* he stresses the pragmatic aspect of colonial argumentation rather than pre-existent political theory. His examination of the influence of Beard and the position of Beard's chief critics, while brief, is clear and balanced. In describing the resumption of leadership by the colonial merchants in 1773, however, he appears to fall into the common error of assuming that there was something discernible which could be described as "the people." He writes: "Now [the merchants] had rushed forward again crying 'Monopoly' and with that frightening word persuaded the rest of the population that the company's low-priced tea would be a token of bondage." Possibly the implication that "the people" were united on this issue is merely the result of the perils of condensation, but certainly it seems to ignore the work of men like Jameson and Gipson and many others who have declared impressively for disunity and conflicting purposes. One also wonders whether condensation dictated an absence of reflection on the problem of the negotiation of peace, about which the author writes: "The American peace commissioners . . . took the liberty of violating their instructions and the terms of the alliance by negotiating what amounted to a separate peace. By so doing . . . they got space enough for Americans to prove themselves and their principles."

In *The War for Independence* Professor Peckham recounts the military history of the war clearly and with verve. The narrative is informed by a consistent endeavour to emphasize those aspects of the war which suggest that the Americans "like other peoples, have been distinguished as much by how we have fought as

by what we have fought for." While this adds another dimension to the inherently exciting military story it also leads, in this case, to some very nationalist pleading—the justification of which it is difficult to document in so confined a space. The author rejects, for example, the traditional division of the colonial population into thirds—revolutionary, loyalist, and neutral. Instead, he writes: "From my own reading, I would guess that possibly one million, or half the white population, favored the Revolution. . . ." Again, he dismisses the opinion that the French won the war, although he discusses carefully the decisive battle at Yorktown where the French constituted over two-thirds of the land force and all of the naval blockade. The warriors under Washington, Peckham argues, were simply better fighters than the enemy. This was so, apparently, because they were citizen soldiers and knew for what they fought, while the "British fought for their king as a reflex conditioned to tradition. . . ." While some of this can be sustained, quite a bit of it cannot. Nevertheless this volume is one of considered scholarship and properly emphasizes the distinctive contributions made to military history by Washington's "citizen army."

Samuel P. Hays in *The Response to Industrialism, 1885–1914* provides a group of essays devoted primarily to the problems of populist-progressivism. The book is held together by two major themes. The first is the familiar one; "The American people subordinated religion, education and politics to the process of creating wealth. Increasing production, employment and income became the measures of community success and personal riches the mark of individual achievement." The second theme is the development of revisionist opinion about the sources of reformism, much more perceptively worked out than recent contributions to the same theme by men like Nevins and Hacker. Professor Hays agrees that much of populist-progressivism "arose because vast changes caused by impersonal industrial forces could easily be attributed to the personal behaviour of businessmen." But he is more concerned to analyse conflicting group, sectional, and class interests and to suggest that "reforms" were often opposed by some branches of the dispossessed, while many of the well-to-do were sponsors of reform. In short, he paints a more complex picture than that which depicts "the discontented poor struggling against the happy rich." He has succeeded in presenting a new synthesis of interpretation which takes full account of scholars like Cochran, Mann, Mills, Hofstadter, and Woodward.

William Leuchtenberg's *The Perils of Prosperity, 1914–32* is perhaps the happiest combination of the topical and chronological approaches in the Chicago series. In addition, its twenty-page critical Bibliography is outstanding. This volume, like most of the others, is concerned with "up-dating" students in the interpretations of the period. The author argues that although the perils of prosperity were real enough "the achievements were, in the long run, more important." He does not minimize the gulf that stretched between *Penrod* at the beginning of his period and *Young Lonigan* at the end, but he gives much more emphasis than is usual to those aspects of the period upon which the future was to build: the quiet movement away from isolationism, mounting resistance to obscurantism in race, religion, and politics, and, of course, the advance in industrial techniques. The portrayal of Wilson's dilemmas is probably the best yet published in so brief a space; and while the "understanding" of the Red scare amounts almost to justifying it, the balance is yet retained in such judgments as: "The 1920's represent not the high tide of laissez-faire but of Hamiltonianism, of a hierarchical concept of society with a deliberate pursuit by the government of policies most favorable to large business interests." In short, this volume comes closest of any in the series to presenting a new interpretation.

After Leuchtenberg, *The New Age of Franklin Roosevelt, 1932-45* is distinctly disappointing. Apart from an excellent chapter on "The New Deal, the Courts and the People," Professor Perkins follows a pedestrian account of his period. Perhaps some readers will find that the notes struck here are of caution and balance; I am inclined to believe that the sound heard is the author's head bumping on the floor as he leans over backward. Professor Freidel, who should know, says the book is "fair-minded and clear." Despite such authority, one must note that Professor Perkins's overwhelming interest in the manifest destiny of the United States leads him to blur rather than clarify many points and, not infrequently, to justify all in the name of predestination. Many illustrations of this could be offered; one must suffice: "The point to bear in mind [about presidential election campaigns] is that the product is better than the process, that out of the distempers of the campaign period come a decision cheerfully accepted and an opportunity to go forward under leadership which in times of stress, as our history shows, has been adequate to its responsibilities."

The most original contribution to the Chicago series is Herbert Agar's *The Price of Power: America since 1945*. Original in that, perforce, it is based mostly upon personal observation, newspapers, and a limited range of public documents. But original also in that it is really a single extended essay on the subject of power; an essay which uses America, as did de Tocqueville, to illustrate the author's main theme. Flamboyantly written it is full of irritating snap judgments, such as the implication that in the 1930's communist sympathizers were merely silly; or the statement that McCarthyism was understandable and about as serious to the nation as whooping cough to an individual ("from time to time we are likely to catch Whooping Senators"). But against these one must place excellent discussions of the whiggery of the Eisenhower administrations and of the failure of the Senate in the face of the investigator. Since this is the book's third printing, and because of its extremely interesting discussion of the implications of power, it is strange that an implicit contradiction has neither been ironed out nor further examined. On page 172 Mr. Agar asserts that "power has no moral content." It seems to me that much of his preceding discussion leads to a rather different conclusion; but, in any case the statement seems odd in the light of his conclusion at page 178. There he argues, in effect, for a new kind of intellectual and moral power: "Why not admit that all things changed forever at Potsdam, when the news came that those 'babies' had been 'satisfactorily born'? At that moment, as we have said, war lost its immemorial meaning; so why not seek a substitute? Why not attempt new thoughts for our new world? . . ." Possibly I read a contradiction into this which may, in fact, be only ambiguity. In any case it is too interesting a point to leave unexamined.

Consider now the miscellaneous titles grouped around problems of the Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Negro question. Harold A. Small's presentation of his father's Civil War memoirs in the *Road to Richmond* (University of California) has become deservedly well known and is now available for the first time as a paperback. The freshness and impact of the writing is proof again that students probably learn little about the reality of past events from monographs and textbooks. This is a Northerner's account of life in the Army of the Potomac, but it tells all that needs to be known about the nature of the war experience—particularly since Major Small's diary of war prison life in the South is included. For life behind the Southern lines *The Confederacy* (Longmans Meridian) is an excellent mirror. Professor A. D. Kirwan, a Southerner by birth, training, and present employment at the University of Kentucky, brings the balance of a border-state man to this wide-ranging selection of documents—which becomes the best

short volume of primary sources for an understanding of both the achievements and discontents of the Confederacy. Kenneth M. Stampp's *The Causes of the Civil War* (Prentice-Hall) is yet another attempt to present the debate about causation—on the basis of contemporary opinions and later analyses. While the introductory comments are not entirely uninfluenced by the author's own view that the war could and should have been avoided—perhaps the only tenable view for an historian writing in the 1950's—the selection of readings provides a very representative cross-section of all major shades of opinion. It is now the best collection on the question within its price range.

Vintage Books have made Paul H. Buck's *Road to Reunion, 1865–1900* (McClelland & Stewart) available in paperback form. Originally published in 1937 this study at once became a standard work in the field. While it remains such it is necessary to note that the work of C. V. Woodward and others have placed in doubt a number of its points of interpretation and even of information. It was, perhaps, easier to write in 1937 than it would be in 1959 that "the hurt was in the past [after the 1877 Compromise] and, while the South remained a problem often vexatious, the proportions of that problem were never again to reach the degree where they would overwhelm the good sense of the country." Or to conclude simply that the race problem was insoluble and that acceptance of that fact by the majority of Americans in 1900 was the beginning of wisdom.

The talents of two Southerners are combined in the *Negro Question* (Doubleday Anchor) to present a quite different view of the compromise and its aftermath. The volume consists of selections from the writings of George W. Cable and is edited by Arlin Turner of Duke University. Himself an ex-Confederate soldier, Cable wrote in the years following 1885 about the responsibility of the Southern whites to help complete the course of the Negro to full civil rights. He believed that there was a "silent South" which agreed with him; and for these views he was bitterly assailed by the racists whom Buck tacitly defends. Cable's analysis of colour prejudice and of the specific means by which it might be obliterated is subtle, perceptive, and realistic. But it is a realism which believes in making things possible rather than accepting existing limitations—as when he writes: "We have got to build a nationality as free from all civil estrangement as from social confusion, yet wider than the greatest divergence of human races." This is a valuable addition to the historical literature on the post-Civil War South since it includes not only essays from the previously published *The Silent South* and *The Negro Question* but also some previously unpublished manuscripts from the Cable Collection at Tulane University.

Dykeman and Stokeley's *Neither Black Nor White* (Rinehart; Clarke, Irwin), which was first printed in 1957, gained wide praise from American liberals. It is contemporary journalism of a high order surveying the Southern scene with a sensitive intelligence. Advocating some degree of patience, yet insisting on the need for inflexibility of purpose, the argument is summed up in the quoted observation of a displaced Alabamian: "The question used to be *how* we lived, now the question is *if* we live. Actually I suppose the two are one: how we live determines if we live." As in most journalism there is a tendency to the mathematical balancing of arguments, as if this automatically produces objectivity; but there is compensation in the depth of treatment and the artistry of presentation which make this volume properly comparable to Cash's *Mind of the South*.

One of the most creative aspects of the New Deal was the Federal Writers' Project of which B. A. Botkin was folklore editor. Under his direction a large collection was made of the testimony of ex-slaves; this now constitutes an important primary source for any study of the social system of the Old South. Lay

*My Burden Down* (Chicago Phoenix; University of Toronto) is the excellent result of Botkin's effort to extract the essence of this collection which is now in the Library of Congress. The arrangement of the items, while intended to reveal a pattern of life, does not (and was not intended to) obscure the depths of suffering and degradation presided over by Calhoun's peculiar institution. Despite the recent sophisticated history of balanced judgment which is so understanding of the Old and New South, this volume is a standing reproof of the failure of historical imagination.

The author of *The Uprooted* has now produced a collection of readings to supplement his earlier work. In *Immigration as a Factor in American History* (Prentice-Hall) Oscar Handlin's view that the sharp restrictions on immigration imposed between 1917 and 1924 were a reflection of a profound change in the nature of Americans and American society is evident; but the range of readings is wide and covers all points of view adequately. The excerpts are mostly from contemporary sources and span the years from 1840 to 1920.

Finally, it is worth noting that Rinehart has made available in paperback a number of titles in the "Rivers of America" series and that L. B. Simpson's standard and stimulating Mexican history (*Many Mexicos*, first published in 1941) is also available in paperback through the University of California Press. All in all, one emerges from a survey of this particular array of paperbacks with the feeling that they represent a considerable achievement in scholarship, editing, and publishing.

KENNETH McNAUGHT

The University of Toronto

### American Intellectual

AMONG THE MOST interesting of the volumes in paper covers now pouring off the presses are those which fall roughly into the category of American intellectual history. A casual glance at the titles suggests the vigour with which American historians have attacked this area of their country's past.

Among the books which fall into this class are four in particular which offer perceptive general interpretations of American life. Daniel J. Boorstin's *The Genius of American Politics* (Chicago Phoenix; University of Toronto) offers the most convincing conservative interpretation of the American experience that has appeared to date. His central thesis is that the genius of American history is its lack of metaphysical abstraction; Americans have been "empirical and legalistic rather than metaphysical and ethical in debating our national issues." From the time of the earliest colonists down to the current age of crisis Boorstin finds an essential continuity, a sense of what he calls "givenness," which is a belief that American society was founded permanently in the past, but which nevertheless has a contemporaneity for every generation. For Boorstin there have been no radical ruptures in this tradition, for even the Revolution and the Civil War were debated as legal questions with the participants claiming that they wished to preserve their particular legalistic views of American society. This view is not really convincing, for it is not unusual for revolutionaries to speak in conservative, legalistic terms, especially in the English-speaking world. His most stimulating chapters deal with the undoctinaire nature of religion and politics in America. In keeping religion and politics on an essentially pragmatic level the divisiveness which both can produce has been avoided. In his concluding chapter, Boorstin makes the point that attempts to provide America with a political philosophy have failed because the American way of life defies theoretical analysis; it is a practice not a theory. Ideas leap from every page of this stimulating little volume

and the cheap edition should provide a well-deserved wider audience. Yet, having closed the book one feels that Professor Boorstin has produced an elaborate theory to prove that the genius of American politics is its lack of theory. His theory, like others applied to broad areas of historical experience, occasionally has the appearance of a rather conservative Procrustean bed.

Henry Steele Commager in *The American Mind* (Yale; Burns and MacEachern) makes no attempt to encompass the entire American experience but limits himself to the period since the 1880's. Commager is a liberal who is extremely interested in the theoretical side of the American character. His sympathies are not with the pragmatic conservatives but with the responsible social critics who are dissatisfied with the "givenness" of American history. Many of his chapters are brilliant, especially those dealing with the philosophy of social Darwinism in its popular form. Moreover two sections, one on the literature of the now popular twenties in which he offers a well balanced criticism of the social irresponsibility of Fitzgerald, Lewis, and Mencken, and the concluding chapter on twentieth-century America, are themselves brilliant essays in liberal social criticism. One is left with no doubt after reading this volume that those Americans who have been given to theorizing have made a contribution to their country's development that is underestimated by Professor Boorstin.

A third volume which attempts a synthesis of the American character is *The People of Plenty* by David M. Potter (Chicago Phoenix; University of Toronto). Potter's main contention is that the students of the "behavioral sciences" and the students of history have something to offer one another in the study of national character. His own essay is an attempt to show that economic abundance has had a most fundamental effect on the evolution of the *genus americanus*. His chapters on "Abundance, Mobility and Status," "Democracy and Abundance," and "The Institution of Abundance: Advertising," contain valuable insights into the way in which potential economic abundance has shaped the national character. His plea that more attention should be given by Americans to the hucksters of Madison Avenue is a sound one. But his concluding chapter which attempts to relate the findings of the "behavioral scientists" to the history of national character is very disappointing, bogging down on such points as the significance of breast and bottle feeding in the development of the traits of American childhood. On the whole it is doubtful if Potter has added anything new to the perceptive comments of de Tocqueville on the subject of American wealth and social mobility—and the Frenchman did it without the pretentious apparatus of the "behavioral sciences."

A fourth book which offers some generalizations about American life is Dexter Perkins's *The American Way* (Cornell; Thomas Allen). Perkins's perspective is more orthodox than the other three authors in that he confines himself to an examination of the American political tradition. Each of the "isms" is given fairly standard treatment, and the conclusions lack originality. Once more we are told that Americans are empirical and pragmatic, and although each of the political creeds examined has contributed something to the American way of life, this nebulous entity is more than the sum of these diverse faiths. For Perkins the American way is libertarian, practical, and the product of a fluid society.

These comprehensive treatments of the American experience are all valuable and stimulating, but they need to be measured against more specialized studies. The present offerings by the paperback publishers provide some fine opportunities for such a measurement. Cornell (Thomas Allen) has done all students of American history a great service in republishing four volumes dealing largely with the colonial period of American history. Charles M. Andrews in *Our Earliest Colonial*

*Settlements* offers a carefully constructed comparison of the five earliest colonial settlements. Each colony had its peculiar characteristics, but Andrews insists that they had more in common than just their North American environment—they were all products of seventeenth-century England. This fact, the author emphasizes, is one that should never be hidden in interpretations of colonial development. In the never ending feud between cultural and environmental interpretations of American history it is good to have Andrews' views again readily available. His view is shared by T. J. Wertenbaker in *The Golden Age of Colonial Culture* where the point is stressed that American colonial culture in the eighteenth century was transplanted English culture, though the needs and limitations of the colonies modified and reshaped it. The colonists most conscious of their Englishness were the people who became the United Empire Loyalists. These *émigrés* were the first American conservatives, and in one sense the only real conservatives in American history. Their characteristics are thoughtfully explored by L. W. Labaree in his *Conservatism in Early American History*. Loyalty, caution, and pessimism, as well as vested interests, typified the colonial Tory in the 1770's. It is perhaps true that ever since the departure of these people for Canada, the United States has been searching for a new conservative tradition and Canada has been searching for a radical one.

The final book in the Cornell list is E. B. Greene's *Religion and the State*. In this fine little volume, so timely in view of the recent rumblings in the United States, the author examines the development of church-state separation in America. His early chapters analyse the European tradition in the seventeenth century and its transplantation to the American colonies, where he finds factors which modified and liberalized it. Gradually the separation of church and state became a unique American experiment, which long ago led Lord Bryce to remark that the United States was mercifully exempt from the church-state conflicts which characterized European history. Bryce spoke too soon. Greene's last chapter, which briefly examines the testing of the American tradition, underlines those areas of education and politics where church-state relations have been far from free of conflict.

Another book on the colonial period of American history is Perry Miller's fine biography of *Jonathan Edwards* (Longmans Meridian). Edwards is the one exception that Boorstin is prepared to allow to his claim that the American Puritans rapidly lost their proclivity for theology in favour of more practical projects. At a time when Puritan theology was succumbing to "pride," liberalism, and even deism, this great intellectual of backwoods America assumed the task of synthesizing seventeenth-century philosophy and science with his inherited Calvinism. His achievement was most impressive, as is Perry Miller's in explaining it.

The connection between Edwards and Thomas Jefferson is perhaps closer than is readily apparent. Jefferson's running mate in 1800, the redoubtable Aaron Burr, was Edwards' great grandson. More important, Jefferson represented in religion everything that Edwards hated. Both were influenced by the thinking of Locke and Newton, but where these reinforced Edwards' Calvinism, they led Jefferson in the direction of deism and liberal optimism. In his *Autobiography* (Putnam's Capricorn; Longmans) Jefferson reveals himself as a liberal philosopher of the "aristocracy of Virtue." The most interesting passages of the book are those which reveal Jefferson as the moderate, almost conservative, politician who observes the events of the French Revolution and shows his own sympathies for constitutional monarchy. Alexander Hamilton was never more right than when he judged Jefferson a much more moderate, temporizing politician than Burr in 1800.

Even the author of the Declaration of Independence seems to fall under de Tocqueville's well-known dictum that "Americans love change, but they dread revolution." The story of de Tocqueville's visit to America and the gradual evolution of his views is now available in a cheap and somewhat abridged edition of G. W. Pierson's *Tocqueville in America* (Doubleday Anchor). Most American political science since the 1830's has been based on the original views of the young French liberal aristocrat. Pierson's book, itself a remarkable contribution to intellectual history, is an indispensable concordance to any serious study of *Democracy in America*.

In the 1830's Jackson's America was an attraction to anxious and inquisitive Europeans, much as Russia and China are to Westerners today. De Tocqueville was only one of a number of Europeans who crossed the Atlantic to observe the American experiment. Another spectator was the German immigrant, Francis J. Grund. Grund's *Aristocracy in America* (Harper Torchbook; Musson) is now published for the first time. Written to prove that de Tocqueville was inaccurate in claiming that America lacked an aristocracy, the book was largely a failure and is now justly forgotten. His aristocracy seems to be little more than a collection of people with social pretensions. Many of Grund's comments simply supported de Tocqueville's claim that there was nothing in America for conservatives to conserve. Of the whigs Grund observed, "they do not endeavour to *preserve* what they possess but strive to *acquire more*; they are not associated with the past but entertain bright hopes for the future . . ." Like de Tocqueville, Grund, with his European background, was quick to appreciate the dilemma of American conservatives.

Many people would regard de Tocqueville as the greatest foreign commentator on America, with Lord Bryce a close second. Not so Louis J. Hacker who has edited and abridged a welcome new edition of the *American Commonwealth* (Putnam's Capricorn; Longmans). With a full heart Hacker describes Bryce as "the best foreign friend the United States has ever had and his *American Commonwealth* is the greatest book written about this country." This is not the place to disagree with the editor although one might hazard the guess that his attraction to Bryce stems from the fact that the English liberal was somewhat less critical of the United States than his French predecessor. Still Professor Hacker is to be commended for his careful editing, and especially for the inclusion of the famous chapter on the Tweed Ring which was deleted from the earliest American editions.

Both Bryce and de Tocqueville were fascinated by the peculiarities of American religious practices. One notable tendency of American religion has been the way in which theological (though not denominational) differences have been muted and religion transformed into a social activity. This characteristic is perhaps partly explained by the impact of liberal theology on American church life. One stage in this development was the transcendentalist movement. O. B. Frothingham's *Transcendentalism in New England* (Harper Torchbook; Musson) is both a commentary on and a document of this movement, for it is a history of transcendentalism by a transcendentalist. The movement, with its roots in Kantian idealism, was part of the reform spirit that permeated many areas of American thought in the decades before the Civil War. While its humanitarian spirit is still admired, transcendentalism marks the transformation of the sternly intellectual and Biblical religion of Jonathan Edwards into the liberal, non-theological religiosity of the progressive American melting-pot.

Nathan Glazer believes that not only Christians, but also Jews, have lost their peculiarities in the American melting-pot. His view, well argued in *American*

*Judaism* (University of Chicago; University of Toronto), is that, like many Protestant denominations, the Jews have allowed their synagogues to become social centres rather than places of worship. John Tracy Ellis, in *American Catholicism* (University of Chicago; University of Toronto), takes a rather different view concerning his religion. On the whole he is optimistic about the ability of the Roman Catholic Church to maintain its characteristic differences from other religious groups. At the same time, however, he argues that his church has become Americanized to the extent that it fully accepts the American way of life, including the separation of church and state. Both these volumes are part of the "Chicago History of American Civilization" series.

Henry Adams was a man much concerned about the place of religion in a modern mechanized society like his America. Two collections of his writings, *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma* (Putnam's Capricorn; Longmans) and *A Henry Adams Reader* (Doubleday Anchor) have recently appeared in paperbacks. The troubled and often tiresome mind of Henry Adams are here well represented (with some overlapping). When all the intriguing paradoxes posed by Adams are examined, one must still conclude that though "The Rule of Phase Applied to History" may win the admiration of neo-Spenglerians, it is Adams' more orthodox historical writing that has stood the test of time.

The American economy, the American judiciary, and the American sense of humour are the subjects of the last three volumes under review. Thurman Arnold's *The Folklore of Capitalism* (Yale; Burns and MacEachern) is a brilliant, witty criticism of the free enterprise mystique. First published in 1937 its impact was doubtless very great as the reviews quoted on the back cover suggest. Today its impact is considerably deadened by the cushion of the welfare state. Properly used however, it makes a fascinating document in the Veblen tradition of the United States in the days of F. D. R.

The career of Judge Learned Hand stretches across the first half of the twentieth century. His papers and addresses collected by Irving Dillard in *The Spirit of Liberty* (Vintage; McClelland & Stewart) is an impressive and inspiring statement of one American's liberalism, and causes one to regret that Hand was never appointed to the Supreme Court. The essay on Justice Holmes is an enlightening interpretation of that great man's career, while the well-known "Spirit of Liberty" deserves to be classed with other moving pleas for liberalism in the English-speaking world.

No comment on national character would be complete without a word about humour. In the *Comic Tradition in America* (Doubleday Anchor) Kenneth S. Lynn offers an anthology of American humorous essays. Apart from certain well-known pieces by Washington Irving, Mark Twain, and Finley Peter Dunne, the book is really not very humorous. Moreover the editor has limited his selection to the nineteenth century. Has America in the twentieth century no sense of humour apart from the buffoons and "sickniks" of the movie and TV screens? Perhaps Harry Golden will produce a twentieth-century Mr. Dooley. At any rate Mr. Dooley's review of Teddy Roosevelt's activities in the Spanish American War, entitled "Alone in Cuba," is worth consideration by all reviewers. "I've thried Hinnissy," Mr. Dooley continued, "to give you a fair idee iv this remarkable book, but what I've tol' ye is on'y what Hogan calls an outline iv th' principal pints. Ye'll have to r-read the book ye'erself to get a thrue conception." Similarly with the paperbacks here reviewed.

RAMSAY COOK

The University of Toronto

## European

*The Nationalist Revival in France, 1905-1914.* By EUGEN WEBER. University of California Publications in History, LX. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1959. Pp. x, 237. \$5.00.

THE PHENOMENON of a nationalist revival in France before 1914 has long been recognized and studied. There have been differences about the precise date of its origin, and the precise character it had, but everyone has been talking about more or less the same thing. Mr. Weber's scholarly and substantial study does not present any fresh evidence, despite the range of his reading. He simply chooses 1905-6 as the year in which patriotism became respectable again in France and formed the essence of the new nationalism, a date which many contemporaries (Péguy was one) likewise saw as marking an end and a beginning. What Weber has done is to collate the press and public debates with private papers (published) and follow the evolving movement very closely indeed. He concludes that the new nationalism was principally centred in the capital, and that the provinces, in so far as they shared the spirit at all, were content to take their lead from Paris. His distinction between the old nationalism (Barrès, Maurras) and the new (Millerand, Poincaré) seems a point well made, but minor speculations sometimes become puzzling—a discussion of “defensive patriots” and “offensive nationalists,” for example. And in so substantial a work it is a little disappointing to be told, “I have not drawn any definite conclusion on the relationship between public opinion and public policy, but I have tried to show how much one affects the other, how opinion created for policy's sake may eventually influence policy that in turn will influence opinion” (p. 152), not least because he adds later on, “I look forward to reading through the prefects' reports of 1914, if they still exist when they should be made available in 1965. Although certainly there will be found in them much to interest and amuse, I doubt that they would change my present impression of the situation” (p. 201). This seems to me just disappointing and does not even advance us as far as others have already done. Still, for all that, Mr. Weber's detailed and spirited work is a very worthy companion to Jacques Chastenet's *La France de M. Fallières*.

JOHN C. CAIRNS

The University of Toronto

*The Prophet Unarmed: Trotsky, 1921-1929.* By ISAAC DEUTSCHER. London and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1959. Pp. xvi, 490. \$7.75.

THE CONTRIBUTION of Isaac Deutscher to the literature of Soviet studies is imposing and promises to continue to grow. His biography of Stalin, while hampered by want of evidence and the author's pro-Trotsky predilections, remains the best work on the subject. *The Prophet Armed*, his biography of Trotsky to 1921, is excellent, and its sequel, *The Prophet Unarmed*, is better still. One may therefore expect much of his final volume on Trotsky and his promised two-volume biography of Lenin, completing the projected trilogy on the three great leaders of Bolshevism.

On two grounds *The Prophet Unarmed* may be considered the best of Deutscher's works. First, it is the only one of his biographical studies that is able to make extensive use of the kind of archival material that most great biographers require. In the study of Soviet history it is only the fortunate writer

whose subject may be treated on the basis of such materials, but scholars of Trotsky and the Opposition have at their disposal the personal archives of Trotsky, given to Harvard by the widow of the great revolutionary. Although this material casts little light on the period before 1920, it is particularly rich for the decade of the twenties. Deutscher has made excellent use of the Trotsky archives, although the relatively narrow archival research of this reviewer indicates that he has not exhausted their riches, and it will be interesting indeed to compare Deutscher's work with the forthcoming study of the Russian Communist Opposition by Robert Daniels, an American scholar who has diligently sifted the same material. In any case, Deutscher's use of archival and published sources provides the best existing narrative of the struggle for power in Russia following the collapse of Lenin's health in 1922, a historical reconstruction that is both detailed and fascinating.

The second basis for considering *The Prophet Unarmed* the best of Deutscher's books is his willingness to subordinate his determinist preconceptions to the interests of accurate biography. Once an active Marxist, Deutscher previously tended to a rather mechanical explanation of Stalin's rise and Trotsky's fall, treating these events as inevitable functions of History. This interpretation, which was Trotsky's own, was implicit in Deutscher's *Stalin* and explicit in his *Russia: What Next?* written on the occasion of Stalin's death. In his latest volume Deutscher remains a great admirer of Trotsky and makes the best possible case for him as a human being and as an important historical personage, but, except for a brief concluding passage about the relative harmony and disharmony of Stalin and Trotsky with the environment of the twenties, Deutscher does not permit determinism to interfere with his account of Trotsky's struggle with Stalin and his various allies. This account might well lead the reader to conclude that no impersonal abstraction but the voluntary actions of Trotsky and his adversaries decided the outcome of the contest. To be sure, one may differ with Deutscher's opinion that it was Trotsky's "magnanimity" that undid him in his crucial encounter with the triumvirate in 1923. Very likely Trotsky's failure to exploit Lenin's attack on Stalin's "chauvinistic" nationality policy at this time resulted more from a Russian chauvinistic tendency in Trotsky than from magnanimity. But *The Prophet Unarmed* usually treats these points of controversial interpretation without determinist prejudgements.

Although Deutscher is primarily interested in Trotsky's political life, *The Prophet Unarmed* includes some interesting glimpses of his personal affairs and a considerable chapter on his writings in the arts and sciences. In these fields Trotsky clearly possessed the talents of a first-rate journalist: wide-ranging self-confidence, vigorous imagination, and an easy literary fluency. That his writings exceeded this, as Deutscher believes, may be more controversial. At any rate, it is interesting to read of the intellectual tolerance of Trotsky in such matters as the dispute between the Freudian and the Pavlovian psychologists. An admirer of the liberal strain in Trotsky, Deutscher does not contrast his pluralism concerning psychology and the arts with the arrogant monism that Trotsky continued to display concerning the equally difficult questions of history and society.

Readers of Deutscher will inevitably find points of disagreement with so vigorous and imaginative a biographer, but they are not likely to deny that this is essential reading for students of Soviet history.

ROBERT H. MCNEAL

The University of Alberta

*War Memoirs, General de Gaulle: Unity, 1942-1944.* By CHARLES DE GAULLE. Translated by RICHARD HOWARD. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited]. 1959. Pp. 340. \$6.00.

GENERAL DE GAULLE begins the fascinating, inspiring, and occasionally exasperating second volume of his memoirs by stating his aim: to reconstitute the unity of "lacerated" France, to restore the "image of themselves the French have always had" by bringing back to the homeland "independence, Empire and a sword." Why does he feel it incumbent upon himself to undertake this difficult mission? Scattered throughout the volume are the elements of his answer. He believes himself to be one of the rare war leaders to recognize that the French military struggle is actually "moral and political." This fundamental fact, according to de Gaulle, transfers "legitimacy" from the Pétain Government to his own Free French movement: the former lacks "independence" of the Germans; the latter is based upon the "public salvation" and, therefore, is the sole continuation of the eternal French Republic. Perhaps even more important is his belief in the mystical identification between himself and his country, a conviction which despite vehement criticism by others (notably by Churchill) constantly intensifies throughout to the personal and national apotheosis at the liberation of Paris where de Gaulle does not hesitate to describe himself as the "instrument of destiny."

How does the author achieve his aim? Four stages of evolution are lucidly and magnificently described. First comes North Africa where, from a nadir of power, he was able to establish his political and military domination over competing French factions. Second, relations with the great powers, especially Britain and the United States, where he was at last able to secure recognition for his movement and participation in the military campaigns of Italy and France. Third, relations with the Resistance in France, where he became the actual as well as the symbolic chief of the movement. Finally, the liberation of France and of Paris itself. Here, in the most moving passages of the entire volume, de Gaulle describes the realization of his aim, the triumphal progress down the Champs Elysées to Notre Dame on August 26, 1944, where the "glories of the past" were mirrored in "one of those miracles of the national consciousness" of the present.

The careful reader cannot, however, avoid recognizing that there are fundamental omissions in de Gaulle's presentation, some of them deliberate, others inseparable from the nature of the memoir-writing process, especially the French variety of it as seen in the post-1945 apologies of Gamelin, Weygand, Reynaud, Juin, *et al.* Nowhere does de Gaulle face squarely the fact that his own act of defiance and indiscipline of June 18, 1940, however splendid and whatever its justification, was fundamentally responsible for the disunity of France he would here give his life to repair. The actual sources of the powerful motivation for this rebellion and this mission, his identification with the nation, are not shown. These roots are located in his professional group, the pre-war French officer corps which, while outwardly obedient and not openly an independent "fief" as was Darlan's navy, (de Gaulle gives an indignant description of this state of affairs), had long possessed what might be called a split image of loyalty: that is, a concept of the nation as distinct from that of the régime. With this concept came a functional corollary, conditional obedience to the régime and a high degree of identification between the corps itself and the nation. Hence, de Gaulle's original step of rebellion can readily be understood as the action of a typical self-possessed and authoritarian officer who could reject Vichy as not consonant with the nation and its grandeur. Finally, there are the omissions resulting from the special points of view adopted in the North African, diplomatic, and resistance narratives. Here,

respectively, de Gaulle's fantastic use of intrigue to destroy a politically inept Giraud at Algiers is not mentioned; the impossibility of Britain and the United States treating France as a great power at the lowest ebb of her fortunes is carelessly omitted; and the serious reservations held throughout by many factions in the Resistance concerning de Gaulle as their leader are simply ignored.

In conclusion, mention must be made of de Gaulle's characteristic suspicions of official United States policy regarding the Free French, his veritable persecution complex concerning Roosevelt, and his sense of icy remoteness and isolation from others as he becomes a myth-maker of nationalism and a living legend himself. But neither omissions nor idiosyncracies can, in the last analysis, detract from the stature of the author as the only figure in modern French history with, in Alexander Werth's words, "Character, Prestige and a Doctrine." They merely illustrate that here again, partisanship is inseparable from greatness, both past and present. Many clues to de Gaulle's present eminence are contained in this volume: his determination not to allow the "years of disease within the State" under the Third Republic to occur again; his concept of authority as based on the "voice of the people," upon an indissoluble link without intermediaries between the "majority and [me]"; his specific plans for the new régime, based upon the principle of "deliberation is the work of many. Action, of one alone." For, as he reveals in his last line, Unity, the purpose so brilliantly achieved, has really been merely a means to another end. Although he does not put it in quite these terms, it is to heal the breach between nation and régime which was responsible for the defeat of 1940 and which, indeed, made possible his own original revolt. "Now the people and the leader . . . were to begin the journey to salvation." Sixteen years later, the question is still whether this salvation can be attained.

PHILIP C. F. BANKWITZ

Trinity College  
Hartford, Connecticut

*Edward T. Cardwell: Peelite.* By ARVEL B. ERICKSON. Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, XLIX, part 2. 1959. Pp. 107. \$2.00.

CARDWELL is worth a biography and the first serious attempt deserves our consideration. Based almost entirely on original sources, the present volume is a more important contribution to historical knowledge than the author's earlier biography of Sir James Graham and, with some revision, deserves a better format than the brown paper cover and double columns of the American Philosophical Society publications. Professor Erickson assumes little knowledge on the part of his readers and with a direct matter of fact approach works his way systematically through Cardwell's public life, largely ignoring the private person that lay beneath the surface. Indeed the book is a series of essays on Cardwell's occupancy of successive public offices, the Board of Trade, the Irish Secretaryship, the Colonial Office and finally, of course, the War Office, interspersed with brief accounts of his role in party politics in the periods in which he was out of office. The section on the Colonial Office is subdivided into sections on Jamaica (the longest), Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and West Africa (but not South Africa), which contain detailed information on the problems of these separate colonies for the years 1864-6. Cardwell is given much credit for Canadian Confederation coming about when and in the way that it did. The best section, however, is the one dealing with Cardwell's great reforms at the War Office.

The book contains some useful information about Cardwell's career and the public affairs with which he was connected, but unfortunately its value is marred by various slips and factual errors. In 1847 Cardwell did not consider Oxford as an alternative to Liverpool (p. 8), but the reverse; the Peelites did not vote together consistently from 1846 to 1857 (p. 9); it is misleading to speak of the Peelites as Grahamites after 1850 or of Graham as their leader (p. 10); the Don Pacifico debate was in 1850 not 1851 (p. 10); it is incorrect to say that Derby could not form a government after the election of 1852 since he was already in office (p. 13); Cardwell's Railway and Canal Bill of 1852 is described as a "substantial measure" in one paragraph and a "piddling Bill" in the next (p. 15); Sir Edmund Head was not Governor General of Canada in 1866 (p. 33). It is a great pity that Professor Erickson has spoiled so much valuable research by rushing into print too quickly.

J. B. CONACHER

The University of Toronto

## Canadian

*A Source-book of Canadian History: Selected Documents and Personal Papers.* Compiled by J. H. STEWART REID, KENNETH McNAUGHT, and HARRY S. CROWE. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company. 1959. Pp. xvi. 472. Text edition, \$6.50, trade edition, \$8.75.

PRINTED COLLECTIONS of source material of various types—constitutional, political, economic and, to a much lesser extent, social—have long been available to Canadian historians. Even so, their needs for teaching purposes have by no means been filled, and even if they were, in this age of mounting prices for out-of-print and rare books, a considerable outlay of money would be involved in the acquisition of a private library of printed documents. The university instructor and the high school teacher will therefore welcome the appearance, at low cost, of a comprehensive volume, embracing the period from the discoveries to the second World War. For in assembling this source-book the compilers have culled from printed collections, previously used chiefly by specialists, documents that illuminate not only "high-points" of our country's development, but also phases of Canadian history which are often inadequately treated in textbooks. In addition, some personal papers, the most noteworthy from the Macdonald, Laurier, and Woods-worth collections, have been made available in printed form for the first time.

The selection of "key" or "basic" documents of a national history, and particularly of a national history that is in the process of being partially re-written from new perspectives and with new determinisms, is bound to reflect conventional judgments as well as private enthusiasms. When a topical arrangement is adopted, as in this case, the contrast between traditionalism and modernism is striking. The section on "The Conquest and Its Problems," for example, follows the usual analysis of the constitutional problem, a problem which is still seen from the Canadian, rather than from the imperial, point of view. A post-Confederation section on "Political Parties and the Party System" is organized in such a manner as to focus attention on the art of politics as practised by Macdonald and Laurier and to give more than usual emphasis to the source, and the strength, of sectional discontent and political dissidence. What is particularly noticeable in connection

with the development of party philosophy and strategy is the sacrifice of reference to the question of participation in imperial wars and to the autonomy movement; both matters on which party leaders were forced by circumstances to clarify their thinking. Without doubt restriction of space imposed, as it always does, limitations on the general treatment, but even so, one is struck by such omissions of related aspects of a single topic, when, to embroider another topic, as many as four double-column pages are assigned to the Winnipeg strike and as many as fifteen to extracts from the *Report of the Royal Commission on Price Spreads*.

There remains, in this reviewer's mind, some confusion as to what the compilers intended to be the scope of this volume. We are told in the preface that a second volume is planned which will illustrate more fully "the problems of dominion-provincial relations, imperial relations, and foreign policy, and . . . discuss the impact of industrialism upon Canadian society and politics" with particular reference to "the twentieth-century Canadian nation." Yet, already some of the cream, at least in the field of twentieth-century social and economic problems, has been skimmed. And the Introduction to the second section of the book (pp. 188-191) seems to imply that it was intended to include in the present volume all significant developments down until 1939. Furthermore, the final section, "Some Recent Views of the 'Canadian Question'," ends on a note of assessment.

If the collaborators have lacked a well-defined aim, they will at the same time cause some disappointment to those teachers who have private enthusiasms of their own. About one-third of the space is devoted to the pre-Confederation period, and in this section little reference is made to landholding in French Canada, to land development policies in Upper Canada, and generally to economic change and economic issues other than reciprocity. It is surprising to find that the documents collected by Professor and Mrs. Innis and by Professor Lower have not been utilized. The inclusion in the first section of the book of the topic, "The Winning of the West," a tale which is carried down to Riel's execution, and to which forty pages are assigned, will satisfy westerners who like to have their area incorporated into the national picture, but such lengthy treatment upsets the balance and does curious things to the chronology: the execution of Riel is followed by the Quebec Conference. In the second section of the book, the portion on the Pacific Scandal and its political ramifications seems inordinately long; on the other hand, one is grateful for the fairly extensive discussion of the issue of public ownership of transportation, as well as for Pope's correspondence on the privileges granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The late Laurier period is thin; Bourassa receives only incidental reference; and Borden, as Prime Minister, might never have existed. In illustrating the constitutional position of the Governor General, Dufferin gets all the limelight; Minto and Byng none.

Yet, whatever these caveats, it must be admitted that it is a tremendous convenience to have so much brought within the boards of a single book, and to have such excellent use made of Hansard, the reports of Royal Commissions, and previously unpublished papers. It is also pleasant to have a great variety of historical sources and historical literature represented, although it is sad to see some old favourites such as Garneau dropped, and disappointing to find little use (except in the case of New France) made of travel literature or such acute observations on the Canadian scene as those by Susanna Moodie and Letitia Hargrave.

In the matter of detail, the book has some flaws. It will be frustrating for the serious student to discover that the bibliographical citations are incomplete and inconsistent in form. Even if they were exposed to pressure from the publisher to reduce expenses, the compilers should not have considered omitting place and date

of publication and exact page references. Often the dates of documents are missing; sometimes the name of the addressee is left out. Statutes such as the British North America Act are selected from secondary works. There seems to have been no settled policy as to which edition of an early work should be used: for example, Dryden's *Up the Columbia for Furs* is used instead of the original Alexander Ross, but when it comes to Harmon, the recent Lamb edition is passed over. The usefulness of the book as a reference work has been reduced by the failure to include an index, which is almost a necessity when the topical arrangement results in the platforms of Canada First and the Patrons of Industry being brought into close proximity to the Conscription debate. And it is of no help at all, in my opinion, to have the topical headings placed at the foot of the pages in the text.

In preparing a second printing, some printers' errors and slips in spelling should be corrected: F. M. Howay (p. ix); Pelley (p. 156); *laissez-faire* (p. 191); Sir Georges Cartier (p. 308); Sir Wilfred Laurier (pp. 320, 370); Canadian National Railway system (p. 325); (R.B.) Bennet (p. 331). Mills appears as Minister of the Interior in 1887 (p. 363). The editorial comment on page 152 implies that the founding of the forts on the upper Fraser followed upon Fraser's descent of the river. The statement on page 191 concerning the disparities of incidence of the depression does not jibe with the findings of the Rowell-Sirois Commission.

Whatever the flaws and the shortcomings of this source-book, it is a major work which will prove an invaluable aid to teachers and students. For this reason, the compilers may be considered to have achieved their purpose. It is to be hoped that it will find its way into every high school library and into the hands of a great many university students. If this happens, more than one unwary student may find his attention rivetted to some aspect of Canadian history which will be new to him, and a new historian will be in the making. It is to be regretted that the publishers have not facilitated this purpose by supplying a more attractive format, paper of better quality, and a more durable binding.

MARGARET A. ORMSBY

The University of British Columbia

*George Croghan: Wilderness Diplomat.* By NICHOLAS B. WAINWRIGHT. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture. 1959. Pp. x, 334, maps. \$6.00.

IN 1926 the late Albert T. Volwiler published his *George Croghan and the Westward Movement*. At that time the bulk of the Croghan papers were not to be found and the author took it for granted that they had been destroyed. The discovery of these papers among those of the Cadwalader family and the present availability of other collections of documents, those of Loudoun, Abercromby, Clinton, and Amherst among them, is the justification for a new biography of a none too familiar scoundrel, by the editor and research librarian of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

George Croghan may not have been cast in the heroic mould; he may not have occupied the front rank of the historic personalities of his own day; but that he is an interesting figure and one well worth writing about, there can be no denying. Soldier, trader, Indian agent under Major George Washington and later Sir William Johnson, and unscrupulous land speculator, he was truly a representative American frontier type—a man of convivial habits, of courage and resourcefulness, with an eye for easy dollar, and the will to carry through questionable business

dealings in an equally questionable way. The list of sober substantial citizens who fell under Croghan's spell is a long and rather surprising one. It is less surprising that those who trusted him lost their money if not always their faith in him. It is not surprising at all that both the British and the American authorities regarded him with suspicion and treated him as a traitor during the American Revolution.

In this biography the author traces the several stages of Croghan's career prior to and after the Seven Years' War. He touches upon Croghan's activities as an Indian trader from Pennsylvania, as Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Northern Department, and as a colonial expansionist. The broad outline of this story is not one unfamiliar to Canadians, but the later chapters will bring a great deal of new information to them and for this we must acknowledge our debt to the author. He has added details to the Volwiler account of which Volwiler knew nothing: accounts of Croghan's dealings with his partners Hockley and Trent, which make it quite clear that it was Croghan's own mismanagement and not the machinations of the French from Canada that brought about his failures; and accounts of Croghan's relations with Thomas and Samuel Wharton and their great dreams of a colony south of the Ohio, the colony of Vandalia, which was to bring wealth and respectability to Croghan, and honour and public office to the Whartons. Full of enthusiasm Samuel Wharton wrote to Croghan "Keep up your spirits my friend. You will soon be not only a rich but a public, respectable man." The fact is that he became neither.

Mr. Wainwright's reappraisal of Croghan is a useful, well-documented study. More useful, perhaps, to American than to Canadian historians. But a book, none the less, which no Canadian, interested in the history of Indian policy, or in American westward expansion, particularly in the critical period between the Seven Years' War and the American Revolution, can afford to ignore. There are several maps between the covers of this book. The reader will wish that there were more of them, and better ones at that.

GEORGE F. G. STANLEY

The Royal Military College of Canada

*Les Français dans l'ouest canadien.* Par DONATIEN FRÉMONT. Winnipeg: Les Editions de la liberté. 1959. Pp. viii, 162, cartes. \$3.00.

ABOUT 6 PER CENT of the population of western Canada is of French origin, the majority being migrants or the descendants of migrants from Quebec. It is impossible to determine the exact proportion who trace their origin to the migration of overseas French during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but M. Frémont demonstrates that the influence of this group has been large in relation to their relatively small numbers. His book provides a detailed account of the arrival and subsequent trials, tragedies, and triumphs of the old country French in each of the four western provinces. It is a story told with authority, pride, and engaging enthusiasm, since the author was himself one of the migrants and for a quarter of a century edited French-language newspapers in Prince Albert and Winnipeg. Much of the narrative describes the experiences of individual colonists and the development of the group settlements which were an important feature of the migration. There are also many revealing glimpses of the motives of individual colonists and of clerical and lay colonizers.

This is a useful and interesting book—useful because it assembles much scattered published data and augments it with specially collected reminiscences, interesting because of the variety and singularity of personalities to be found

among the colonists. Heightening this interest is the fact that, more completely than any other immigrant group, the old country French represented every segment of European society—nobility, bourgeoisie, intellectuals, and urban and rural workers.

Historians will find here little on Canadian government immigration activity in France, and will also regret that M. Frémont has not given a fuller treatment of the relationships of the colonists with the French Canadians and with the English-speaking community. Nevertheless it is a valuable contribution to the literature of western Canadian settlement. It is a much larger book than the pagination indicates, since the format is double column in small type.

LEWIS H. THOMAS

Regina College,  
The University of Saskatchewan

*Stephen Leacock: Humorist and Humanist.* By RALPH L. CURRY. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc. [Toronto: Doubleday Publishers]. 1959. Pp. 383. \$4.95.

NEARLY SIXTEEN years ago (March, 1944) Stephen Leacock died. The work under review appears to be the earliest attempt to provide a definitive biography. Painstaking is the most accurate characterization that may be ventured. The author has made full use of the personal papers in the Stephen Leacock Memorial Home (of which he is Director), and the manuscript collection at McGill University, as well as the recollections of persons who were closely associated with Leacock. From these sources emerge a competent and well-organized narrative, and a figure which anyone who knew him would instantly recognize as that of Stephen Leacock.

Curry's evaluations of Leacock's works are not always easy to accept. This is particularly true of the five or six volumes of historical writing that began with the composite biography of LaFontaine, Baldwin and Hincks in 1907 (Vol. XIV of the *Makers of Canada*), and ended with *Canada and the Sea*, completed in the year of his death. These are scarcely works that establish Leacock's footing as "Canada's most famous author." Nor does Curry say anything of Leacock's verse, in which he displayed the cutting edge so conspicuously absent in his prose.

A curious lack of understanding of the Canadian idiom runs through the Leacock biography. Where at McGill is to be found the "Arts Hall," in which Leacock lectured? One can almost hear the Olympian disdain of "Hank" Auden and "Choppie" Grant at such Americanisms as "faculty" and "campus" applied to U.C.C. In 1937 how formidable was "the Orangeman-controlled political machine in Ontario"? Fortunately, Leacock's chief characteristics knew no boundaries, and Curry is on incontestable ground in selecting the greatest—his kindness and genuine concern, and of these, the reviewer who experienced them, wishes to add his humble acknowledgement.

J. I. COOPER

McGill University

## Recent Publications Relating to Canada

PREPARED IN THE EDITORIAL OFFICE OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS  
BY MARION POPE

NOTICE in this bibliography does not preclude a later and more extended review.

The following abbreviations are used: *B.R.H.*—*Bulletin des recherches historiques*; *C.H.R.*—*Canadian Historical Review*; *C.J.E.P.S.*—*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*; *R.H.A.F.*—*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*.

See also *Canadiana*, a monthly list of Canadian publications prepared by the National Library, Ottawa; *External Affairs*, published monthly by the Department of External Affairs; *Journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth*, issued quarterly by the General Council of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; and, in the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, "Letters in Canada," published in the July issue.

Sections of the bibliography omitted from this issue for reasons of space will be included in later issues.

### I. CANADA'S COMMONWEALTH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

ALLEN, H. C. *The Anglo-American Relationship since 1783*. London: Adam & Charles Black [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1959. Pp. 247. \$3.50. A revised and enlarged edition of Part I of *Great Britain and the United States: A History of Anglo-American Relations, 1783-1952*. To be reviewed later.

BRADY, ALEXANDER. The Modern Commonwealth (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXVI (1), Feb., 1960, 62-72).

OSGOOD, ROBERT E. NATO: Problems of Security and Collaboration (*American Political Science Review*, LIV (1), March, 1960, 106-29).

SCHNEIDER, FRED D. Britain's Legacy of Empire (*South Atlantic Quarterly*, LIX (1), winter, 1960, 54-68). The author seeks to assess "the nature of Britain's contribution to the concept of empire."

SMITH, EVAN. Canada and the Colombo Plan (*Canadian Banker*, LXVII (1), spring, 1960, 50-60).

THORNTON, A. P. *The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies: A Study in British Power*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1959. Pp. xvi, 370. \$5.75. To be reviewed later.

### II. HISTORY OF CANADA

#### (1) General History

BREBNER, J. BARTLET. *Canada: A Modern History*. With a final chapter by DONALD C. MASTERS. University of Michigan History of the Modern World. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press [Toronto: Ambassador Books Limited]. 1960. Pp. xviii, 554, xviii. \$10.00. To be reviewed later.

- LANCOT, GUSTAVE. *Histoire du Canada. I. Des origines au régime royal*. Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin Limitée. 1959. Pp. 460. \$4.75. To be reviewed later.
- MCCLEAVE, ROBERT J. Canadian Broadcasting: Study in Co-existence (*Gazette*, V (3), 1959, 323-9).
- POPE, MAURICE, ed. *Public Servant: The Memoirs of Sir Joseph Pope*. Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1960. Pp. 312. \$4.50. To be reviewed later.
- REID, J. H. STEWART, McNAUGHT, KENNETH, and CROWE, HARRY S., comps. *A Source-book of Canadian History: Selected Documents and Personal Papers*. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company. 1959. Pp. xvi. 472. Text edition, \$6.50, trade edition, \$8.75. Reviewed in this issue.
- STACEY, C. P. *The Victory Campaign: The Operations in North-West Europe, 1944-1945*. Official History of the Canadian Army in the Second World War, II. Maps drawn by C. C. J. BOND. Published by authority of the Minister of National Defence. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer. 1960. Pp. xiv, 770, maps. \$4.00. To be reviewed later.
- THWAITES, REUBEN GOLD, ed. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents (1610-1791)*. Paterson, N. J.: Pageant Books Inc. 1960. 36 vols., illus. \$400.00 the set. This is a limited reprint of the original 73-volume work.
- WARNER, DONALD F. *The Idea of Continental Union: Agitation for the Annexation of Canada to the United States, 1849-1893*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press for the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. 1960. Pp. xii, 276. \$5.00. To be reviewed later.

### (2) Discovery and Exploration

- ANDERSON, BERN. *Surveyor of the Sea: The Life and Voyages of Captain George Vancouver*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1960. Pp. xii, 274. \$6.75. To be reviewed later.
- GUNTHER, ERNA. Vancouver and the Indians of Puget Sound (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, LI (1), Jan., 1960, 1-12). The author discusses Vancouver's expedition to the west coast in 1792.
- KERKONEN, MARTTI. *Peter Kalm's North American Journey: Its Ideological Background and Results*. Studia Historica. I. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society. 1959. Pp. 260, map. \$3.50. To be reviewed later.
- TALMAN, JAMES J. Champlain as an Explorer in Inland North America (*Vermont History*, XXVIII (1), Jan., 1960, 22-32).

### (3) New France

- BARBEAU, MARIUS. *Trésor des anciens Jésuites*. Museum Bulletin no. 153. Ottawa: National Museum. 1959. Pp. 242, illus. \$1.50.
- BÉGIN, EMILE. *François de Laval*. Québec: Les Presses Universitaires Laval. 1959. Pp. 222, illus. \$3.50.
- KENNEDY, S. D. General James Wolfe (*Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1960, 32-44).
- HICKERSON, HAROLD. The Feast of the Dead among the Seventeenth Century Algonkians of the Upper Great Lakes (*American Anthropologist*, LXII (1), Feb., 1960, 81-107).
- LAMONTAGNE, ROLAND. La Contribution scientifique de La Galissonnière au Canada (*R.H.A.F.*, XIII (4), mars 1960, 509-24).
- LEFEBVRE, ESTHER. *Marie Morin: Premier historien canadien de Villemarie*. Préface du LIONEL GROULX. Collection Fleur de Lys, dirigée par GUY FRÉGAULT et MARCEL TRUDEL. Montréal et Paris: Fides. 1959. Pp. 211, illus. \$5.00. To be reviewed later.
- REILLY, ROBIN. *The Rest to Fortune: The Life of Major-General James Wolfe*. London: Cassell [Toronto: British Book Service (Canada) Limited]. 1960. Pp. xvi, 367, illus. \$7.00. To be reviewed later.
- SÉGUIN, ROBERT-LIONEL. La Canadienne, aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (*R.H.A.F.*, XIII (4), mars 1960, 492-508).
- TRUDEL, PAUL-EUGÈNE. *Monseigneur Ange-Marie Hiral: Fondateur et gardien à Québec*. III. Montréal: Editions françaises. 1959. Pp. 255. \$2.50.

## (4) British North America before 1867

- BOND, C. C. J. The British Base at Carleton Island (*Ontario History*, LII (1), March, 1960, 1-16).
- BRUNET, MICHEL. Les Canadiens et la France révolutionnaire (*R.H.A.F.*, XIII (4), mars 1960, 467-75).
- HITSMAN, J. MACKAY. Alarum on Lake Ontario, Winter 1812-1813 (*Canadian Army Journal*, XIV (5), Jan., 1960, 116-27). This article was originally published in the fall, 1959 issue of *Military Affairs (U.S.)*.
- LITTLE, C. H., ed. *The Recapture of Saint John's, Newfoundland: Dispatches of Rear-Admiral, Lord Colville, 1761-2*. Occasional Paper, 6. Halifax: The Maritime Museum of Canada. 1959. Pp. 38. \$50.

## (5) Canada since 1867

- Documents of Western History—Minutes of the North-West Council, 1873-4, (*Saskatchewan History*, XIII (1), winter, 1960, 25-30).
- FORRESTER, MARJORIE. Shooting the Stars and Chaining the Land (*Beaver*, outfit 290, spring, 1960, 10-17). A report on the trip of the North American Boundary Commission of 1872-5.
- KOS-RABCEWICK-ZUBKOWSKI, LUDWIK, and GREENING, WILLIAM EDWARD. *Sir Casimir Stanislaus Gzowski: A Biography*. Published under the auspices of the Engineering Institute of Canada. Toronto: Burns & MacEachern, Ltd. 1959. Pp. vi, 213. \$4.75. To be reviewed later.
- MALLORY, J. R. The Appointment of the Governor General: Responsible Government, Autonomy, and the Royal Prerogative (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXVI (1), Feb., 1960, 96-107). The author discusses this problem with particular reference to the appointment of Tweedsmuir in 1934-5.
- STACEY, C. P. *Records of the Nile Voyageurs, 1884-1885: The Canadian Voyageur Contingent in the Gordon Relief Expedition*. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1959. Pp. x, 285. Free to members. To be reviewed later.
- THOMAS, W. K. Canadian Political Oratory in the Nineteenth Century: III (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXIX (3), autumn, 1959, 377-89). A comparison of the speeches of Joseph Howe with those of his contemporaries.
- WOODCOCK, GEORGE. Louis Riel: Defender of the Past (*Beaver*, outfit 290, spring, 1960, 24-9).

## III. PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL HISTORY

## (1) Newfoundland and the Maritime Provinces

- BLAKELEY, PHYLLIS R. Halifax's Royal Commander (*Atlantic Advocate*, L (5), Jan., 1960, 25-31). The author writes about the visit of the Duke of Kent to Halifax, 1794-9.
- COBBETT, WILLIAM. Selections of Autobiography about His Early Life and Days in the Maritimes (*Atlantic Advocate*, L (6), Feb., 1960, 50-62; L (7), March, 1960, 65-72; L (8), April, 1960, 56-62).
- KERR, J. LENNOX. *Wilfred Grenfell: His Life and Work*. Foreword by LORD GRENFELL OF KILVEY. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1959. Pp. 272. \$4.00. To be reviewed later.
- MACKINNON, FRANK. The Strait: The Story of Prince Edward Island's Political and Economic Isolation (*Atlantic Advocate*, L (7), March, 1960, 73-81).
- WALLIS, WILSON D., and SAWTELL, RUTH. *Malecite Indians of New Brunswick*. Museum Bulletin no. 148. Ottawa: National Museum. 1959. Pp. 52, illus. \$75.
- WATSON, P. H. *The Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Halifax Dockyard*. Occasional Papers, 5. Halifax: The Maritime Museum of Canada. 1959. Pp. 32. \$50.

## (2) The Province of Quebec

- ARÈS, RICHARD. Procès et condamnation du nationalisme canadien-français (*Relations*, no. 229, jan. 1960, 6-8). L'auteur discute l'étude de Maurice Tremblay sur ce sujet dans *Ecrits du Canada français*.

- BOUCHARD, T. D. *Mémoires de T. D. Bouchard. I. Ma vie privée*. Préface de ARTHUR MAHEUX. Montréal: Editions Beauchemin. 1960. Pp. 170. \$3.00. To be reviewed later.
- BRIÈRE, ROGER. La Percée touristique (*Revue canadienne de géographie*, XIII (1-2), jan.-juin 1959, 39-52). The author discusses the effect of geography, both physical and cultural, on the tourist trade with particular reference to the area around Percé.
- DRAPEAU, JEAN. *Jean Drapeau vous parle*. Montréal: Editions de la Cité. 1959. Pp. 124. \$1.00.
- Duplessis and His Heirs: A Great Transition in Quebec (*Round Table*, no. 197, Dec., 1959, 17-25).
- THÉORET, PIERRE-EUCHER. *Monsieur Lussler (1835-1911): Un homme, un prêtre*. Ile Perrot, P.Q.: Chez l'auteur. 1959. Pp. 309. \$2.75.

### (3) The Province of Ontario

- CRAIG, HAMILTON. The Loyal and Patriotic Society of Upper Canada and its Still-born Child—the "Upper Canada Preserved" Medal (*Ontario History*, LII (1), March, 1960, 31-52).
- EMERSON, J. NORMAN, ed. New Pages of Prehistory (*Ontario History*, LII (1), March, 1960, 53-76). A series of short articles about the various archaeological investigations now in progress in Ontario.
- FLEMING, ROY F. Disaster on the Thames River, near London, Ontario (*Inland Seas*, XV (4), winter, 1959, 299-305). The story of the sinking of the ferry, "Victoria," on May 24, 1881.
- MARTIN, JOHN D. P. The Regiment De Watteville: Its Settlement and Service in Upper Canada (*Ontario History*, LII (1), March, 1960, 17-30).
- MYERS, FRANK A., comp. A History of the Hudson's Bay Company Post at Little Current, Ontario (*Inland Seas*, XV (2), summer, 1959, 88-96; XV (3), fall, 1959, 222-32; XV (4), winter, 1959, 276-82; XVI (1), spring, 1960, 47-59).

### (4) The Prairie Provinces

- CLIPSHAM, MURIEL. Nainabush Stories (*Saskatchewan History*, XIII (1), winter, 1960, 19-24). Various stories of the Ojibwa about their folk hero, Nainabush.
- MACNEISH, R. S. *Archaeology of Southeast Manitoba*. Museum Bulletin no. 157. Ottawa: National Museum. 1959. Pp. 184, illus. \$1.00.
- SANGWINE, JEAN. Squire Sowden's Opera House (*Beaver*, outfit 290, spring, 1960, 50-3).
- WALKER, JAMES. My Life in the North-West Mounted Police (*Alberta Historical Review*, VIII (1), winter, 1960, 1-14). The author's personal recollections of five years in the force.

### (6) Northwest Territories, Yukon, and the Arctic

- FAIRLEY, T. C., ed. *Sverdrup's Arctic Adventures: Adapted from New Land; Four Years in the Arctic Region*. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company. 1959. Pp. xii, 305. \$6.00. To be reviewed later.
- KIRWAN, L. P. Polar Exploration in the Last Twenty Years (*Geographical Magazine*, XXXII (7), Dec., 1959, 355-64). Maps.
- *The White Road: A Survey of Polar Exploration*. London: Hollis & Carter [Montreal: Palm Publishers]. 1959. Pp. x, 374, illus., maps. \$6.00. To be reviewed later.
- LLOYD, TREVOR. Canada's Northland (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (4), winter, 1960, 529-37).
- MELDGAARD, JÖRGEN. Origin and Evolution of Eskimo Cultures in the Eastern Arctic (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, LX (2), Feb., 1960, 64-75).
- MONTURE, G. C. The Indians of the North (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (4), winter, 1960, 556-63).
- NEATBY, L. H. Arctic Journals (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (4), winter, 1960, 575-88). The author discusses the journals written about some of the early expeditions to the Arctic.

- NICHOLSON, N. L. The Northwest Territories: Geographical Aspects (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, LX (1), Jan., 1960, 2-27). Maps.
- PHILLIPS, R. A. J. The Arctic: Its Human Resources (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (4), winter, 1960, 564-74).
- RICHARDS, J. HOWARD. Northland or Promised Land? (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (4), winter, 1960, 538-47).
- ROSS, W. GILLIES. Parry's Second Voyage (*History Today*, X (2), Feb., 1960, 100-5).
- WILSON, J. TUZO. Possibilities for Physical Research in the Canadian Arctic (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (4), winter, 1960, 519-28).

#### IV. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

- Food for Thought*, XX (6), March, 1960. This issue is devoted to various aspects of education in the North.
- GUILLET, EDWIN C. *In the Cause of Education: Centennial History of the Ontario Educational Association, 1861-1960*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1960. Pp. xxiv, 472, illus. \$7.00. To be reviewed later.
- MATHESON, THOMAS. La Mennais et l'éducation au Bas-Canada (*R.H.A.F.*, XIII (4), mars 1960, 476-91).
- PEAKE, F. A. Theological Education in British Columbia (*Canadian Journal of Theology*, V (4), Oct., 1959, 251-62). A short history of the development of the various provincial institutions for such education.

#### V. RELIGIOUS HISTORY

- BEAMIER, J. L. *Marie Guyart de l'Incarnation, fondateur des Ursulines au Canada, 1599-1672*. Trois-Rivières: Editions du Bien Public. 1959. Pp. 270, illus. \$2.50.
- KNIGHT, F. STANLEY, ed. *Peter Fuller: His Steps and His Life Principally from His Own Diaries*. Meaford: Privately printed. 1959. Pp. 35. The diaries of one of the founders of the Anglican Church in Meaford, Ontario.
- MACDONALD, CHRISTINE. Pioneer Church Life in Saskatchewan (*Saskatchewan History*, XIII (1), winter, 1960, 1-18).
- MILLMAN, THOMAS REAGH. *A History of the Parish of New London, Prince Edward Island*. Kensington, P.E.I. 1959. Pp. iv, 71, illus. \$3.50. Copies may be ordered from the Rev. W. E. Inghram, Kensington, P.E.I.

#### VI. GENEALOGY

- CONSTANT, PHILIPPE. La descendance de François Bruneau et de Marie Prévost mariés à Québec en 1669 (*Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, X (3 et 4), juillet et oct. 1959, 129-45).
- LORANGER-PAQUETTE, J. Robert Rivard, Sieur de Loranger (*Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, X (3 et 4), juillet et oct. 1959, 116-28).
- Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, (1 et 2), jan.-avril 1959, contient ces études généalogiques: "Jean Maurier dit le père Véron," "Famille Lanctot," "Les Descendants de Pierre-Honoré Joubert," et ces notes: "Eva Gauthier," "Pierre Richaume," "Sébastien Brisson," "Honoré Martel," "Jean Saindon et Véronique Côté," "famille Landry," "Adhémar dit St-Martin."
- SHAW, L. M. Two Hamilton Families (*Western Ontario Historical Notes*, XVI (1), March, 1960, 1-18). An article on the Baker and Stinson families, long time residents of Hamilton.
- VALOIS, RICHARD. L'ancêtre des Valois en Amérique (*Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, X (3 et 4), juillet et oct. 1959, 108-15).

#### VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Library Association Bulletin*, LIV (4), April, 1960. This issue is devoted to Canadian libraries and librarianship and was prepared as an introduction to and

souvenir of the 1960 Montreal Conference. It includes an article by W. Kaye Lamb on the National Library and one by Ian C. Wees on early libraries in Montreal and Quebec.

BISHOP, OLGA. Checklist of Historical Works on Western Ontario in the Libraries of the University of Western Ontario: Lambton County; Essex County (*Western Ontario Historical Notes*, XV (4), Dec., 1959, 59-63; XVI (1), March, 1960, 32-9).

Canadian Historical Review. *Index: Volumes XXI-XXX, 1940-1949*. Compiled by the Editorial Department of the University of Toronto Press. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. vi, 404. \$15.00. The fifth in a series of decennial indexes begun in 1907 for the annual *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* and continued for its successor the *Canadian Historical Review*. The index is a guide not only to the articles and reviews published in the *C.H.R.*, but also includes author and subject references to all titles which have appeared in the *Review's* lists of "Recent Publications Relating to Canada."

LEMIEUX, GERMAIN, éd. *Index analytique des 35 documents de la Société historique du Nouvel-Ontario*. Sudbury: La Société historique du Nouvel-Ontario. 1959. Pp. 48.

TAYLOR, K. W. Economic Scholarship in Canada (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXVI (1), Feb., 1960, 6-18).

### VIII. ARTS AND SCIENCES

#### (1) Literature, Art, and Music

BUCHANAN, D. W. Alfred Pellán (*Canadian Art*, XVII (1), Jan., 1960, 16-21).

HOUSTON, JAMES. Eskimo Graphic Art (*Canadian Art*, XVII (1), Jan., 1960, 8-15).

MACLEOD, MARGARET ARNETT, ed. *Songs of Old Manitoba: With Airs, French and English Words and Introductions*. Foreword by W. L. MORTON. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1959. Pp. x, 93. \$4.00.

PACEY, DESMOND. A Colonial Romantic: Major John Richardson, Soldier and Novelist: Part I, The Early Years; Part II, Return to America (*Canadian Literature*, no. 2, autumn, 1959, 20-31; no. 3, winter, 1960, 47-56).

PIERCE, LORNE. *A Canadian Nation*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1960. Pp. x, 42. \$2.00.

WYCZYNSKI, PAUL. *Emile Nelligan: Sources et originalité de son oeuvre*. Visages des lettres canadiennes. Ottawa: Éditions de l'Université d'Ottawa. 1960. Pp. vii, 349.

#### (2) Science, Industry, and Agriculture

DUNCAN, C. C. Resources and the Canadian Economy (*Australian Quarterly*, XXXI (4), Dec., 1959, 81-9).

MACFARLANE, DAVID L. The Prospect for Canadian Agriculture (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (3), autumn, 1959, 416-22). The author discusses the role of public policy in the problems of modern farming.

MCGUIRE, B. J., and WILD, ROLAND. Kitimat: Tomorrow's City Today (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, LIX (5), Nov., 1959, 142-61. Illustrated.

RICH, E. E. Trade Habits and Economic Motivation among the Indians of North America (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXVI (1), Feb., 1960, 35-53).

ROBERTSON, R. G. The Material Prospects of the North (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (4), winter, 1960, 510-18).

TAYLOR, NORMAN W. French Canadian Industrial Entrepreneurs (*Journal of Political Economy*, LXVIII (1), Feb., 1960, 37-52).

## Books Received

- BORSODY, STEPHEN. *The Triumph of Tyranny: The Nazi and Soviet Conquest of Central Europe*. London: Jonathan Cape [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited]. 1960. Pp. 284. \$4.75.
- CANHAM, EDWIN D., ed. *Man's Great Future*. Condensed by ROD NORDELL from the fiftieth anniversary edition of the *Christian Science Monitor*. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company. 1959. Pp. xiv, 192. \$4.50.
- CHALONER, W. H., and HENDERSON, W. O., eds. *Engels as Military Critic: Articles by Friedrich Engels Reprinted from the Volunteer Journal and the Manchester Guardian of the 1860's*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 1959. Pp. xx, 146. 25s.
- DOS PASSOS, JOHN. *Prospects of a Golden Age*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1959. Pp. xvi, 271. \$7.50.
- ELIADE, MIRCEA, and KITAGAWA, JOSEPH M., eds. *The History of Religions: Essays in Methodology*. Preface by JERALD C. BRAUER. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1959. Pp. xii, 163. \$5.00.
- FAWTIER, ROBERT. *The Capetian Kings of France: Monarchy and Nation (987-1328)*. Translated by LIONEL BUTLER and R. J. ADAM. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1960. Pp. x, 242, map. \$5.75.
- GIBB, SIR HAMILTON, FYZEE, A. A. A., et al. *The Islamic Near East*. University of Toronto Quarterly Supplements, 4, edited by DOUGLAS GRANT. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1960. Pp. viii, 165-296. \$2.50.
- GOETZMANN, WILLIAM H. *Army Exploration in the American West, 1803-1863*. New Haven: Yale University Press [Toronto: Burns and MacEachern, Ltd.]. 1959. Pp. xx, 509, map. \$6.50.
- GREENE, JOHN C. *The Death of Adam: Evolution and Its Impact on Western Thought*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press [Toronto: Thomas Allen Limited]. 1959. Pp. xii, 388, illus. \$5.40.
- GREW, FREDERICK J. *Wealth and the Common Man*. Illustrations by Fred Frymire. New York: Philosophical Library. 1959. Pp. viii, 184. \$3.75.
- HAYEK, F. A. *The Constitution of Liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1960. Pp. x, 570. \$7.50.
- HOFFMAN, STANLEY H., ed. *Contemporary Theory in International Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1960. Pp. x, 293. \$4.95.
- HYTIER, ADRIENNE DORIS. *Les Dépêches diplomatiques du Comte de Gobineau en Perse: Textes inédits présentés et annotés*. Préface de JEAN HYTIER. Etudes d'histoire économique, politique, et sociale sous la direction de JACQUES FREYMOND et JACQUES L'HULLIER, XXX. Genève: Librairie E. Droz; Paris: Librairie Minard, 1959. Pp. 265. Fr. 30.
- JAMES, F. CYRIL. *On Understanding Russia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. x, 63. \$2.95.
- MASON, ALPHEUS T., and BEANEY, WILLIAM M. *The Supreme Court in a Free Society*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1959. Pp. vi, 346. \$4.90.

- MORAES, FRANK. *India Today*. New York: The Macmillan Company [Galt: Brett-Macmillan Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. viii, 248. \$4.00.
- PAGE, STANLEY W. *The Formation of the Baltic States: A Study of the Effects of Great Power Politics upon the Emergence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia*. Harvard Historical Monographs, XXXIX. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1959. Pp. xiv, 193. \$5.95.
- PERCEVAL, R. W., and GORDON, C. A. S. S., eds. *The Table: Being the Journal of the Society of Clerks-at-the-Table in Commonwealth Parliaments*, XXVII. London: Butterworth & Co. (Publishers) Ltd. 1959. Pp. viii, 208. 35s.
- PERROY, EDOUARD. *The Hundred Years War*. Introduction by DAVID C. DOUGLAS. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company Limited]. 1959. Pp. 376. \$8.75.
- POLANYI, MICHAEL. *The Study of Man*. The Lindsay Memorial Lectures, 1958. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1959. Pp. 102. \$1.75.
- PRIESTLY, J. B. *Literature and Western Man*. London: Heinemann [Toronto: British Book Service (Canada) Limited]. 1960. Pp. xiv, 512. \$9.50.
- RESEK, CARL. *Lewis Henry Morgan: American Scholar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1960. Pp. xii, 184. \$4.50.
- RITNER, PETER. *The Death of Africa*. New York: The Macmillan Company [Galt: Brett-Macmillan Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. xiv, 312. \$4.95.
- STEIN, ERNEST. *Histoire du Bas-Empire*. I. *De l'état romain à l'état byzantin* (284-476). I, *Texte*; II, *Notes et cartes*. Edition française par Jean-Remy Palanque. Paris: Editions Desclée de Brouwer. 1959. Pp. xvi, 672, maps.
- STOUTENBURGH, JOHN, Jr. *Dictionary of the American Indian*. New York: Philosophical Library. 1960. Pp. 462, \$10.00.
- TENENTI, ALBERTO. *Naufrages, corsaires et assurances maritimes à Venise, 1592-1609*. Ecole pratique des hautes-études, VIe section. Centre de recherches historiques, ports, routes, trafics, VIII. Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N. 1959. Pp. 641.
- WHITEHALL, WALTER MUIR. *Boston: A Topographical History*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1959. Pp. xxxii, 244. \$6.50.
- WOLF, ERIC R. *Sons of the Shaking Earth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1959. Pp. xii, 303. \$5.00.
- ZENKOVSKY, SERGE A. *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia*. Russian Research Center Studies, 36. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1960. Pp. xiv, 345. \$8.75.

---

## Notes and Comments

### GOVERNOR GENERAL'S AWARDS

PROFESSOR Douglas Grant has agreed to the publication of the following correspondence in connection with the 1959 Governor General's awards in the English non-fiction category.

PROFESSOR DOUGLAS GRANT  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH  
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

DEAR PROFESSOR GRANT:

I was a little puzzled this year by the failure of the awards committee of which you are chairman to make an award in English non-fiction. As a historian I felt that some of the books were good and some rather better than a good many books that have won medals in the past.

I realize that the categories have been changed and that standards may well be higher or different. I would, however, appreciate fuller information than I have at present. If you could enlighten me I would greatly appreciate it.

Yours sincerely,  
JOHN T. SAYWELL

THE EDITOR,  
CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

DEAR MR. SAYWELL:

Thank you for your letter. I am naturally very sorry that the decision of the Governor General's Awards Committee not to make an award in the category English non-fiction should have perturbed you; though I do appreciate and indeed welcome your concern. I wonder if you are not puzzled by a lack of more precise knowledge of the changes introduced into the system of making awards when the Canada Council generously agreed to take over the financial responsibility; that is, to provide a cash prize of a thousand dollars in each of the six categories (three in French and three in English) in addition to a medal. May I explain briefly what these changes were.

Under the earlier system five awards were made in the following categories:

1. Poetry,
2. Fiction,
3. Creative Non-fiction,
4. Academic Non-fiction,
5. Juveniles;

and in each of these categories an award was always made. Under the new system the five categories have been reduced to three:

1. Poetry,
2. Fiction,
3. Non-fiction,

and an award may be withheld in any category if the Committee thinks fit. May I draw out one or two of the implications that follow from these changes? As there is only one award for non-fiction, in future all writers in this field, whether academic or "creative," will be in competition. The Historian and the Literary Critic will therefore be competing with the professional man of letters. But my use of the word "competition" is misleading; there is no competition; the awards will be given to work which is in the opinion of the Committee of exceptional merit. In a word, they will truly be "awards," and this new conception of them should ensure that there will not be any great variation from year to year in the quality of the works so recognized.

I am sure that once the significance of these changes is grasped there will be general approval of them. I regret the disappointment caused this year because there were several works which in earlier years might have received an award. And the withholding of an award from them was bound to cause unfavourable comment.

I hope that I have explained myself sufficiently and that you are satisfied with the new Committee's intention.

Yours sincerely,  
DOUGLAS GRANT

## CONTRIBUTORS

BERNARD OSTRY is the Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Commonwealth Institute of Social Research, Ottawa.

SISTER TERESA AVILA BURKE is an Associate Professor of History at the Saint Joseph's College For Women in Brooklyn, New York.

